CSCE/OSCE Mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh

Implications for Institutional Evolution and Ideas of European Security

Bradley Miller Reynolds
University of Helsinki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Political History
Master's Thesis
May 2018

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta/Osasto Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty Social Sciences	Laitos/Institution– Department Political and Economic Studies	
Tekijä/Författare – Author Bradley Miller Reynolds		
Työn nimi / Arbetets titel – Title CSCE/OSCE Mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh: Implications for Institutional Evolution and Ideas of European Security		
Oppiaine /Läroämne – Subject Political History		
Työn laji/Arbetets art – Level Master's	Aika/Datum – Month and year May 2018	Sivumäärä/ Sidoantal – Number of pages 120 (With Cover and Abstract)

Tiivistelmä/Referat – Abstract

With ongoing war in Eastern Ukraine and previously perceived collective norms of post-Cold War Europe damaged, questions of cooperation continually plague stability. With the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE– Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe or CSCE prior to 1994) being one of the only actors able to facilitate minimal conflict mediation, a research focus on the institution raises questions of historical reconciliation and subsequently, interpretation of European security.

This thesis adds to the existing body of knowledge by looking at implications of CSCE/OSCE institutionalization in relation to the Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) conflict, the possible application of a peacekeeping operation (PKO) in the region, and the subsequent narratives actors attempted to write through this process. As shown by recent OSCE Network Projects, contemplating narrative is critical when placing the CSCE/OSCE within a larger post-Cold War debate on historiography (Nünlist 2014; Nünlist, Aunesluoma, Zogg 2017; Zellner 2017). This study then tracks various actors' interests in constructing new European conflict management structures and hence, a new meaning of European security after the Cold War.

Politics in various participating states changed during the 1990's and their new commitments to a common CSCE/OSCE narrative became complicated. Within this volatile period, former N+N (Neutral and Non-Allied) states, and momentarily former Warsaw Pact (WP) states, were the most noticeable supporters of new collective European security ideas through their advocacy for CSCE/OSCE institutional evolution. Though Russian and America also supported these visions, their interest in an institutionalized OSCE needed to be encouraged by numerous small states' stalwart commitments to the ideas and norms of the early 1990's. This helped institutionally solidify what are today critical aspects of the European security order. However, as none of these actors are monoliths and can be neatly grouped into strict analytical containers for long periods of time, institutionalization and norms became points of contention as political winds continued to shift. This story will be viewed from three different perspectives: sub-regional (South Caucasus), regional (greater European), and institutional (CSCE/OSCE).

This research stems from an interdisciplinary background in political history, using archival materials, informal interviews, accounts of practitioners associated with the conflict, as well as an array of secondary sources. Constructivist theory on structural security from the Copenhagen School, Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT) (Buzan and Waever 2003), will be applied. In regards to narrative, strategic culture, salience of norms (Hecht 2016), and memory will be briefly employed to discuss how ideas may have influenced actors' perception of a new 'Europe' in relation to security. This allows for an additional lens when attempting to represent small states' perspectives and hence, narrative construction, of security providers in the post-Soviet space.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords
Nagorno-Karabakh, CSCE, OSCE, Conflict Mediation, Institutionalization, Narrative, Salience of Norms, Peacekeeping.

Säilytyspaikka – Förvaringställe – Where deposited
City Center Library

Muita tietoja – Övriga uppgifter – Additional information

Contents

1 Introduction 3
1.1 Literature Review 4
OSCE Studies 4
Western Perceptions of Russian Peacekeeping 9
1.2 Enquiry at Hand 10
1.3 Methodology 12
Narrative 13
1.4 Theory 16
Regional Security Complex Theory 16
Salience of Norms 19
Strategic culture 20
Memory 21
1.5 Remaining Chapters 22
2 Regional Security Complex – Openings 23
2.1 Nagorno-Karabakh War and its Implications 25
2.2 RSC Considerations 30
3 Mediation Competition 33
3.1 CSCE Memories 34
3.2 Towards a Collective Memory? 35
3.3 The Meaning of New European Security in Practice 37
3.4 Concrete Steps 42
3.5 Russia's Shifting Strategic Culture and the CSCE 45
3.6 Realization of Confrontation 51
3.7 International Perspectives and Third Party PKOs 54
3.8 The Spark of a Summit 58
3.9 Chechnya and the Road from Paris 62
4 Sustaining Hope – Institutional Evolution 65
4.1 HLPG Directives – High Level Planning Group 67
Early Euphoria and New Precedents 67
Divergence and Division 75
HLPG Epilog 79
4.2 CPC - Conflict Prevention Center 82
Building a Foundation 82
Nuancing the Foundation 87
4.3 FSC – Forum for Security Cooperation 90
The PKO Debate 10 Years On 91
5 Conclusion 103
Further Study 106
Bibliography 108

List of Abbreviations

Basket I – Political Military Dimension
Basket II – Environmental and Economic Dimension
Basket III – Human Dimension
CC - Consultative Committee
CFE - Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CiO – Chairman in Office
CIS - Collective Security Treaty
CPC - Conflict Prevention Center
CPC/OS - Conflict Prevention Centre, Operations Service
CSBM - Confidence and Security Building Measures
CSCE - Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSO - Committee of Senior Officials
DCiP - OSCE Documentation Center in Prague
EU – European Union
FA - Final Act
FSC - Forum for Security Cooperation
FSC SU - Forum for Security Cooperation Support Unit
FSU – Former Soviet Union
HLPG - High Level Planning Group
IFOR – Implementation Force
IOPG - Initial Operation Planning Group
LOC - Line of Contact
MGIMO - Moscow State Institution of International Relations
MoU - Memorandum of Understanding
MPS – Mission Program Section
NK – Nagorno-Karabakh
OPU – Operations Planning Unit
OSCE – Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe
OSCE-DL - OSCE Internet Archive - Document Library
PC- Permanent Council
PCC - Project Co-ordination Cell
REACT - Rapid Expert Assistance and Co-Operation Team
RoE - Rules of Engagement
RF – Russian Federation
RSC - Regional Security Complex
RSCT - Regional Security Complex Theory
SFOR – Stabilization Force
SOFA - Status of Forces Agreement
ToR - Terms of Reference
UN-ODS - United Nations Official Document System
WP –Warsaw Pact

1 Introduction

In recent years, the European community has witnessed prolonged conflict, leading many observers to comment on the emergence of a new Cold War. When the crisis in Ukraine began in 2014, Christian Nünlist commented on the evolving confrontation as a result of departing narratives. Relevant to this study, he framed these narratives within the context of the Organization of Security and Cooperation (OSCE – Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe or CSCE prior to 1994):

> Diverging historical narratives on the evolution of the post-Cold War order in Europe have become a huge challenge for OSCE reform processes, and they remain a hurdle for overcoming East-West tensions. Radically different versions of how the cooperative security atmosphere of the early 1990s collapsed and led to unprecedented tension between the West and Russia in 2014 nourish mistrust within the OSCE.[1]

This idea of contemporary conflict as a product of neglected historic reconciliation raises highly relevant questions in understanding said conflicts. A historical knowledge of how various actors constructed their discourse of Europe can color a contemporary analysis of confrontation in Europe. Not as a 'new Cold War', but rather an ongoing struggle with memory, acceptance of how the Cold War ended, and the way in which agreements under previous Russian, European, and American leadership have been implemented since.

The conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) had implications for the collapse of the Soviet Union and consequently, was a significant conflict in Russia's new identity struggle over sovereignty in the newly independent states (NIS). Because of this perceived temporal historic significance, the account presented here works to observe markers the mediation process left regarding how the post-Cold War security environment developed. While there is a wide range of analysis on the mediation process, conclusions tend to generalize around the perspective aptly presented by Thomas De Waal in 2010: Armenia and Azerbaijan are not ready for a resolution and there is little interest in resolving the conflict in the international community.[2] While this may be true, a large portion of any resolution stems from the negotiation between Russia and various OSCE participating states for the rights to militarily mediate the conflict after any political agreement is made, also referred to as a peacekeeping operation (PKO). De Waal and many other authors touch

[1] Nünlist, Christian (2014): Helsinki +40 in the Historical Context. *Security and Human Rights*. No. 25. 207.
[2] De Waal, Thomas (2010): Remaking the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Process. *Survival*, August-September 2010. Vol 52. No 4. 174-175.

on this, but neglect to grasp the significance the mediation process had on the perceptions of various small states who invested themselves in a CSCE/OSCE resolution process. By investigating the narrative these actors created within the NK mediation process, an additional discourse can be added to the historiographical discussion on how Europe was defined in terms of security after the Cold War, as well as how such a process unfolded.

1.1 Literature Review

A brief overview of the influential interpretations from the respective fields of CSCE/OSCE Studies and perceptions of Russian peacekeeping as they appear in the OSCE literature and Western conceptualization will be surveyed. They are both significant in shaping the analysis of archival narratives also presented here. CSCE/OSCE studies cover many aspects of the organization, but there are few comprehensive historic accounts of the NK conflict mediation narratives and their institutional implications. Perceptions of Russian peacekeeping highlights how various Western interpretations of Russia as a security provider may have been influenced by ingrained memories of the Soviet Union and the Cold War. Together, these sets of literature account for the foundation for which this study will proceed from.

OSCE Studies

A majority of contemporary literature in the field of OSCE studies focuses on the functionality and relevance of the OSCE in a changing Europe. Academic researchers such as Wolfgang Zellner, Stefan Lehne, and Christian Nünlist have taken up or participated in a growing initiative for deeper historical investigation of a post-Cold War CSCE/OSCE. These projects tend to be produced under the auspices of the OSCE Network, a system of academic institutions that work as "an autonomous OSCE-related track II initiative."[3] One more recent project looks to further examine the ways in which narratives of various participating states influenced perceptions of and trust within the OSCE.

Wolfgang Zellner recently edited a volume outlining different security narratives present in Europe and is highly relevant to the presentation of strategic culture utilized

[3] OSCE Network (2015): Who We Are. *OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions.* http://osce-network.net/about/. (accessed January 5, 2018.)

here.[4] From a critical perspective, the historical period of narrative analysis utilized by many of Zellner's contributors is mainly contemporary, not taking into account deeper cultural and social factors that may shape political narratives. Along with Zellner, Nünlist is a proponent of a historical reappraisal of narratives, memory, and various historiographical divergences that shaped the OSCE of today. Along with the 2014 publication mentioned in the opening, Nünlist most recently produced a report on two OSCE Network oral history workshops, which discussed "the 'Road to Paris' with high-level eyewitnesses who… negotiated the 1990 Paris Charter in Vienna and New York."[5] These works and wider OSCE Network initiatives set a frame of investigation for smaller discourses to be extracted from the perceived history of CSCE/OSCE growth. The work here attempts to place itself within this project, beginning the exploration of a smaller, more nuanced story within the overarching divergence of European post-Cold War securities narratives.

A large portion of the literature in OSCE studies is from historic actors associated with the institution. These accounts are some of the most telling pieces of literature and without them the archival documents would be nothing more than a skeleton for the depiction this thesis presents. With these personal opinion pieces from the 1990's, the divergence of narratives appears as a process that was apparent from the early stages of CSCE/OSCE mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh. These sources are interpreted with a cognizance of their bias, but nevertheless, they give further insight into the security interest and narrative individual states attempted to write in specific periods of history.

Some of the main actors documented in this thesis include: Margaretha af Ugglas, Swedish Minister of Foreign Affairs 1991-1994 and OSCE Chairperson-in-Office 1993, Tarja Halonen, Finnish Minister of Foreign Affairs 1995-2000 (Finland co-chaired the Minsk Group from 1995-1996).[6] Terhi Hakala, Counselor to the Finnish Co-Chairmanship of the OSCE Minsk Group 1995, Heikki Vilén, Finnish General and Chair of the HLPG

[4] Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) (2017): *Security Narratives in Europe: A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany.

[5] Nünlist, Christian; Aunesluoma, Juhana; Zogg, Benno (2017): *The Road to the Charter of Paris: Historical Narratives and Lessons for the OSCE Today.* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic institutions. Vienna, Austria. 9

[6] The Minsk Group was established in 1992 as a preparatory conference for negotiations on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and was eventually given a formal mandate as the Minsk Group at the 1994 Budapest Summit. This hybrid conference planning organ and political medium became the OSCE's main forum for facilitating mediation of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

(High Level Planning Group)[7] from 1995-1996, Andrei Zagorski, Member of the Soviet CSCE delegation from 1987-1991, and John J. Maresca, Member of the US Delegation to CSCE negotiations form 1973-75, US Ambassador to the CSCE 1989-1992, and US Ambassador/Special Representative to the NK conflict mediation process, 1992-1994. While these actors' accounts are significant in the construction of narratives presented here, they should be understood as incantations of specific memories, cultivated due to and part of particular social and collective memories.[8]

Most significant for some of these actors are their origins in the previous N+N block (Neutral and Non-Aligned), exhibiting small states continued influence on the CSCE and new conflict management structures. Following her chairmanship of the CSCE in 1993, af Ugglas warned of the influence Russia would have on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, as well as the organization if it was not countered by other states with an interests in sustaining the CSCE process.[9] Halonen, Hakala, and Vilén are all part of the pivotal period in OSCE institutionalization and PKO planning; Finland in 1995 continued the work of Sweden as the previous Minsk Conference Co-Chair and was responsible for leading initial PKO planning. Hakala commented on the transition and the continued wariness of Russian national interests in the region and a need for Finland to convince Russia that a UN or OSCE based peace was in their best interest.[10] Vilén's perspective is also provocative because he not only speaks about the plausibility of a PKO, but also the mistrust that was growing among Minsk Group members. In the words of Vilén, one particular participating state was sharing classified military information with the conflicting parties.[11] The commonality of these accounts is their subtlety in imply concern about Russia as a divisive mediator in terms of the perceived agreements of the early 1990's. The timing of these accounts is also interesting as it gives a perspective on memory and strategic culture in a

---

[7] An OSCE organ given a mandate at the 1994 Budapest Summit for preliminary military planning of any OSCE PKO in NK.

[8] Cubitt, Geoffrey (2007): *History and Memory*. Manchester University Press. Manchester, UK. 34, 39-40.

[9] Af Ugglas, Margaretha (1994): Conditions for Successful Preventive Diplomacy. In: Carlsson, Staffan (ed.) *The Challenges of Preventative Diplomacy: The Experience of the CSCE.* Norstedts Tryckeri AB, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm. 27.

[10] Hakala, Terhi (1998): The OSCE Minsk Process: A Balance after Five Years. *Helsinki Monitor.* Vol 9, Is 5. Netherlands Helsinki Committee. 9.

[11] Vilén, Heikki (1997): ETYJ:n kriisinhallintamekanismit ja mahdollisuudet yhteistyöhön kriisien toimijoiden kanssa. In: *Rauhanturvaamisen muuttuvat kasvot: oppeja tulevaisuudelle.* Puolustusministeriön Julkaisuja. Helsinki, Finland. NRO 1/1997. 118.

volatile historic moment, rather than a contemporary solicitation shaped by two decades of memory politics and collective identity modifications.

On the Russian side of the account, in 1991 and 1992 Zagorski viewed the new European commitment to the CSCE from a perspective critical of Gorbachev's faith in the West, alluding to the shifting narratives in Russia during the 1990's. Zagorski offered an astute reading of the evolving debate over American interest in NATO as a primary security institution and the French story of the EC. For Zagorski, this reading led to dwindling hopes for a strong CSCE and hence, Russia as an integral part of Europe.[12] More recently, as a Moscow State Institution of International Relations (MGIMO) scholar, Zagorski participated in the OSCE Network 'Road to Paris' oral history project described above. Here he commented on Russian interpretations of the critical juncture in CSCE and European security formation.[13] Also within this project, he reflects on Moscow's perfunctory understanding of such contemporary historical reconciliation projects.[14]

From the American perspective, Maresca offers an in-depth analysis of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict as well as the CSCE/OSCE's growing involvement in conflict resolution. The various books and essays Maresca wrote are very close to the topical content of this thesis. However, the thesis here attempts to be a critical reflection on various narratives, while Maresca offers mnemonic accounts of his personal experience as a negotiator.[15] Because of this, Maresca's interpretations must be understood as memories shaped by a particular life, cultural, and political experience, rather than the "historic realities" and teleological "European evolution" he often refers to.[16] For example, in his first incantation of the Geneva negotiations of 1973-75 he focuses on the US as a primary

---

[12] Zagorski, Andrei (1991): New European Unity: The End of the CSCE? *Paradigms*. Vol. 5, Is. 1. 76-88; Zagorski, Andrei (1992): New Institutions and Structures of the CSCE: Adjusting to the New Europe. *Paradigms*. Vol. 6, Is. 2. 12-25.

[13] Nünlist, Christian; Aunesluoma, Juhana; Zogg, Benno (2017): *The Road to the Charter of Paris: Historical Narratives and Lessons for the OSCE Today.* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic institutions. Vienna, Austria. 26.

[14] Zagorski, Andrei (2017): Russian Narratives. In: Wolfgang Zellner (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Hamburg, Germany. 99.

[15] See: Maresca, John J. (1985): *To Helsinki: The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 1973-1975*. Duke University Press; Maresca, John J. (1996): Lost Opportunities in Negotiating the Conflict over Nagorno Karabakh. *International Negotiation*. Vol. 1, Is. 3. 471-499; Maresca, John J. (2016): *Helsinki Revisited: A Key U.S. Negotiator's Memoirs on the Development of the CSCE into the OSCE*. Ibidem, verlag. Stuttgart, Germany.

[16] Maresca 2016, 3-8.

actor, arguing that the US allowed the Europeans to take the lead due to US disinterest, US perceptions of the conference's eventual failure, and US preference for direct bilateral negotiations with the USSR.[17] But in his later memoirs he focuses on endorsing a European memory of the conference, arguing how the US-led NATO relationship empowered European countries to take on an independent role. The US stood in the background so as to support Western Europe's relationships with the USSR, hence supporting the first unified European negotiating position since WWII.[18] Because of these subtle shifts in memory, his accounts are viewed critically. This allows for a contemplation of how various factors including time, as well as new readings of history, influence memory.

In regards to this specific topic of OSCE mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh and the issue of an OSCE PKO, many works mention the significance of the initial Helsinki II (Helsinki 1992 Summit) PKO mandate. However, few look at the implications within a longer institutional narrative. Rexane Dehdashti gives a very compelling analysis of the negotiations and the likelihood of a multinational OSCE PKO being implemented.[19] This perspective, published in 1997 (in reality written in 1995 and only updated as late as September 15, 1996),[20] is interesting as it directly follows what can be considered the end of a period of high political will resulting from the collapse of the USSR. Larissa Daria Meier comments on a very similar narrative, but does so as of 2016.[21] She utilizes many of the same documents to be presented in this study, but comes to different conclusions because of, as this thesis will attempt to present, a selective reading of the OSCE Archive. Meier presents documentation from periods of high political will and high OSCE prestige 1992, 1993-95, and 2002-2003. Because of this, she values particular documents over others and comes to conclusions that are not always supported by the document narrative as a whole or the memories of key actors responsible for shaping the OSCE PKO. Meier

[17] Maresca 1985, 64
[18] Maresca 2016, 13, 22, 36.
[19] Dehdashti, Rexane (1997): Nagorno-Karabakh: A Case-study of OSCE Conflict Settlement. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 459-479.
[20] Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) (1997): *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands.
[21] Meier, Larissa Daria (2015): *A Role for OSCE Peacekeeping?: From the 1992 Helsinki Guidelines to the Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine*. CORE Working Paper 27. Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Hamburg, Germany.

sometimes neglects the perspectives of small states within larger entities such as the EU, further simplifying the PKO debate.[22] One result of Meier's presentation is the under-appraisal of institutional evolution and subsequently the institution as an actor. This disallows a comparison of the OSCE in periods of low political will and a nuanced analysis of deeper reasoning behind specific statements.

Western Perceptions of Russian Peacekeeping

Russian Peacekeeping is a larger subset of literature that will only be partially covered here. The majority of English language literature on Russian Peacekeeping in the 1990's centers around two main conclusions: Russian PKOs legitimized Russia's humanitarian power in a post-Cold War international order, while simultaneously reasserting Russia's position as a security guarantor in the post-Soviet space. These points are presented and analyzed by journalists and academics, working similarly to the academic researcher, practitioner dichotomy presented in the previous section

Journalists who covered the conflict gave an interesting perspective on Russian peacekeeping, as their sources were usually locals affected by the conflict. According to Nünlist, journalists also "play an important role in fostering (historical) empathy or its lack."[23] Thus journalists have the ability to add supposedly authoritative accounts for the further formation of various narratives.

Journalist Michael Mihalka summarized the perceived ability of Russia to produce peacekeeping forces directly after the Soviet Union dissolved.[24] His account was published in 1996 when the security architecture of a Russian centered Regional Security Complex (RSC) potentially hung in the balance. Mihalka succinctly put the conversation of Russia peacekeeping in the context of an OSCE proposed PKO and the recent Dayton accords. Thomas De Wall, another journalist focusing on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, corroborates many of Mihalka's assertions regarding the inability of Russian peacekeeping in the 1990's. He also gives in-depth accounts of how the collapse of Soviet power actually played out.[25] These accounts give a richer image of the regional situation in which international negotiations were beginning to take shape. They also offer insight into how

---

[22] Meier 2015, 30.
[23] Nünlist, Aunesluoma, and Zogg 2017, 32.
[24] Mihalka, Michael (1996): Nagorno-Karabakh and Russian Peacekeeping: Prospects for a Second Dayton. *International Peacekeeping.* Vol. 3, No. 3. Autumn 1996. 25.
[25] De Waal, Thomas (2013): *Black Garden*. New York University Press. New York

the perceptions of Western audiences were formed about Russia's potential as a post-Soviet security provider.

Nadia Kirilova Milanova, former head of the OSCE Prague Office, outlined Russian peacekeeping priorities in regard to Nagorno-Karabakh with an emphasis on economic interests. This is the closest piece of regional analysis to the work being written here, albeit without the argumentation on institutional evolution. Milanova highlights one narrative presented in the 1990's, where Russia considered itself a first among equals in the post-Soviet Space. Transcaucasia was considered "a post-imperial space where Russia will defend its interests by all means, including military and economic."[26] She outlines Russian ideas as influential in reconstructing a Russian-Caucasian RSC. A more contemporary study by Vadim Romshov and Helena Rytövuori-Apunen also investigates Russian regional economic interests and their relation to NK. Contrariwise, this account passes over the interconnectedness of economic interest and a PKO that Milinova discusses.[27] Though economics is not a critical aspect of the analysis presented here, Milanova as well as Romshov and Rytövuori-Apunen comment on the various different discourses the PKO and NK mediation stories touch.

1.2 Enquiry at Hand

In attempting to add a new perspective to the field, this work proceeds with the following research question: how did the CSCE/OSCE's attempt to create a mediation structure for the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, with specific focus on the proposed OSCE multinational PKO, influence the institution as well as participating states perception of European security? As this is a far reaching question and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict spans over three decades, the research period of 1990-2004 will be utilized. The years of document analysis will begin in 1990 with the CSCE Charter of Paris, which marked a new stimulus in creating a post-post-war Europe. 2004 will be used as the end date, being the year when all former WP countries were fully incorporated into NATO and all except Romania and Bulgaria joined the EU. For many former WP states, acceptance into the EU

[26] Milanova, Nadia Kirilova (2002): *The Conflict Over Nagorno-Karabakh 1992-2002: Ten Years of Missed Conflict Resolution Opportunities.* The University of Exeter, Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Politics. Exeter, UK. 174.

[27] Romashov, Vadim and Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena (2016): Russia's Karabakh policy: new momentum in regional perspective. *Caucasus Survey.* Vol. 5, Is. 2. 1-17.

and NATO were the security guarantees they had been looking for in the early 1990's, but were only offered membership into the CSCE as a placeholder.[28] OSCE institutions will be the main archival chronicles investigated, looking at the Conflict Prevention Center (CPC), Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC), High Level Planning Group (HLPG) from their appropriate year of establishment in the early 1990's until 2004.

In the process of validating this research question, the following assertions will be addressed: the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict was a pivotal environment for the CSCE/OSCE to build institutions and legitimacy in an attempt to construct a 'common European home' idealized in the last 1980's and early 1990's. Small states with a historically traceable commitment to the CSCE/OSCE paradigm of security looked to hold Russia to its re-interpretations of the Helsinki Decalogue commitments under Gorbachev. These commitments entailed human rights and the abdication of 'inviolability of internal affairs' as a new foundation for European security. While small states sustained enough support in periods of low political will to maintain an OSCE envisioned in 1990, they lacked the political force necessary to motivate continued cooperation on conflict resolution in the region. Debates over what norms should embody a new Europe materialized through the competition over the right to mediate and administer post-conflict measures (PKO) in Nagorno-Karabakh. These assertions frame OSCE institutionalization within a wider context framing the struggles of a post-Cold War Europe.

The CSCE/OSCE, based on consensus politics and consequently political equality of participating states, had a vision of bridging the divide between the great powers during the Cold War and building a new cooperative security architecture. Though some states may have believed in this vision more than others, such idealist cooperation was at the core of Helsinki 1975 and CSCE/OSCE mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh. Small states were critical in the establishment of the Final Act in 1975 as well as the continued life and prestige of the conference. Consequently, this thesis will affirm that small actors had the ability to shape a budding European security community and sustain norms of OSCE conflict management and dialogue for future windows of opportunity.

[28] Lehne, Stefan (1991): *The CSCE in the 1990's: Common European House or Potemkin Village?* Braumüller Publishing, Vienna. 30.

1.3 Methodology

The use of history as a social science has become a point of reflection in recent decades. Theorists in social science fields such as international relations and security studies claim to utilize history as empirical evidence to validate their theoretical argumentation. While this is partially true, some fail to go further than "data mining" or reading a historical narrative that validates their claim.[29] In opposition to trends aimed at quantifying social science, the idea of historical institutionalism (HI) is useful in addressing the above mentioned research question. Institutions and ideas play a key role in understanding the story actors chose to write for themselves. Therefore they are useful in studying the CSCE/OSCE as an institution whose legitimacy primarily stems from the power of norms.[30] Finally, a conversation on narrative as a form of historiography is also critical in understanding how ideas of European security were conceived by different actors and subsequently, the story they attempted to write as a result of these perceptions.

While not strictly a methodology, HI represents a strain of historical inquiry that elevates the significance of ideas in organizations as a way of understanding institutional change. The significance of HI here is that it frames the research question in the overarching question of "why a certain choice was made and/or why a certain outcome occurred." It also focuses on actors as norm-abiding as well as self-interested, adding explanatory value to interactions within the frame of the CSCE/OSCE. [31] The perception of actors as such helps explain why Russia and former WP states remained responsive to the CSCE process, even while interpretations of what ideas should shape a post-Cold War Europe continued to diverge.

In an attempt to see the application of ideas fundamental to HI in practice, within the institution, a variety of interpretive experiences helped color the historic analysis presented in this thesis. These institutional experiences include researching at the OSCE Archive, participating in a 2016 OSCE Documentation Workshop, attending the OSCE 24th Annual Economic and Environmental Forum, and attending OSCE presentations in

---

[29] Franzosi, Roberto (2006): Historical Knowledge and Evidence. *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis.* Oxford University Press, New York. 444.
[30] Steinmo, Sven (2008): Historical Institutionalism In: Della Porta, Donatella and Keating, Michael (ed.) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK. 118-138.
[31] Ibid., 126.

Helsinki as well as OSCE lectures in Kazan, Russia. This author was also allowed informal interviews with Czech, Finnish, and American diplomats, Swedish parliamentarians, and OSCE employees.[32]

As the timeframe of this study is from 1990-2004, the ability to interview historic actors was sparse, but good amounts of documents recounting personal experiences were available. As mentioned earlier, there is additional value in using written recollections of mediation as opposed to contemporary invocations, which have experienced two decades of diverging narratives. As Geoffrey Cubitt argues, "different interactive settings may actually promote different patterns of recollection in the individuals who are involved in them."[33] Additionally, interpretations of these experiences and presentations inherently hold the personal bias of this writer. Therefore, this work should be classified more so with textual interpretation as associated with the linguistic and cultural turn in the historic discipline, rather than quantitative social science.

Archival work was undertaken both on the OSCE internet archive,[34] as well as on two trips to the physical OSCE Prague Archive in March 2016 and August 2016. Additional visits were made to the archive during the fall of 2016, allowing for follow up on various research threads. The archive is available to registered researchers under the OSCE Researcher-in-Residence Program. Documents have three statuses: Open, OSCE+, or Restricted. OSCE+ and Restricted cannot be quoted, but researchers may take notes and extract information for their research. The information obtained from these documents must be paraphrased in the author's own terms.[35]

Narrative

Several authors have proposed narrative reflection as a form of peace-resolution strategy, as alluded to by Nünlist. Authors such as Riikka Kuusisto have applied this thinking on narrative construction in a literary and indirectly historiographical sense to

[32] All of the interviews referenced here were conducted off the record in an informal manner. None of the opinions will be quoted or referenced, but they were significant in helping this author interpret how different states constructed narratives of the past.
[33] Cubitt 2007, 129
[34] The online archive can be found at this web address: http://www.osce.org/resources/documents
[35] Prague Office of the OSCE Secretariat (2016): *Recommendations for quoting OSCE documents and using restricted documents as primary sources for academic research on OSCE related subjects.* Researcher-in-Residence Programme. Prague, CZ.

contemporary actors or states. This helps to understand how factions within the state construct personal narratives and thus, the reality in which they make decisions.[36] The idea of narrative construction as an edifice of reality is closely tied to the post-structural understanding of reality as a text, as well as a constructivist understanding of international politics in the Wendtian sense.[37] The constructivist logic found here pairs nicely with HI and the belief that "ideas are the very root of political behavior."[38] In this line of argumentation, how actors conceptualize their realities is crucial in understanding conflict.

Intellectual historian George Iggers presents a basis for understanding narrative construction in historical discourse by quoting Hayden White. He asserts that while history uses "empirically validated facts, it necessarily requires imaginative steps to place them in a coherent story," therefore "a fictional element enters into all historical discourse."[39] This understanding of narrative construction is significant when applied to how actors interpret their own history. Interest may cause a willing neglect of or specific form of critical self-reflection and construction of memory fundamental in narrative construction. For HI, understanding the fictional account of the past actors write is significant because understanding the effect of past ideas is crucial in assessing self-interest in the future.[40]

From a historiographical perspective, it is also important to note that the past can never truly be known. As Kant argued in "The Critique of Pure Reason," knowledge of reality is only obtained through perception, therefore one can never truly know reality as such. When this was applied to historical knowledge, the idea of a scientific objectivity became even more absurd to a section of the community.[41] States as actors are inherently biased by a national interest and various cultural beliefs, but this bias is a primary component of narrative creation. From a constructivist's perspective, this bias is also crucial in understanding how individual and historic consciousness is fashioned. The interpretation of the ideas which came to define CSCE/OSCE institutionalization are

---

[36] Kuusisto, Rikka (2009): Comic Plots as Conflict Resolution Strategy. *European Journal of International Relations.* Is.15 No.4. 601-626.
[37] Wendt, Alexander (1999): *Social Theory of International Politics.* Waveland Press. Long-Grove, IL USA. 187.
[38] Steinmo 2008, 130.
[39] Iggers, George (1999): *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge.* Middletown, CT, USA: Wesleyan University Press. 2.
[40] Steinmo 2008, 133.
[41] Bentley, Michael (1999): *Modern Historiography: An Introduction.* Routledge Publishing. London UK. 20-22.

paramount in understanding actors as dynamic agents with different interpretations of reality, and hence conflict, rather than monoliths stuck in time. An actor's bias becomes a valued, if not necessary part of history as it allowed the presentation of abstract thoughts, outlining each actor's method of arriving at her/his perceived frame of reality.

In line with the various turns in the historical discipline, the account presented here should be considered simply as a new discourse being added to a variety of other 'historical flows'.[42] As the past can never fully be known, this discourse will interpret archival documents and primary accounts of the mediation process, endeavoring to assemble the narratives specific actors wanted to write themselves into within the CSCE/OSCE. A deeper historiographical understanding of past CSCE/OSCE narratives can help others read why Russian narrative construction has become so polarized from the rest of Europe and vice versa. That being said, this work is itself a narrative where efforts of literary imagination were necessary in connecting the document and source interpretation into a coherent story for the reader.

The historiographical frame where this analysis stems from is the Cold War Research Cluster undertaken by the Aleksanteri Institute at the University of Helsinki 2010-2014.[43] This form of historiography focuses on looking at history not through the traditional lens of international relations and diplomacy. Rather it focuses on smaller states and an understanding of agency such actors have in historic social structures.[44] This frame is also closely associated with Michael Cox's renewed research focus on Europe and various small states as primary actors in both the Cold War, and the construction of a new 'Europe'.[45]

Thus, an investigation of narrative within the frame of HI will direct this study towards an understanding of one of the discourses that influenced the contemporary crisis of cooperation within the CSCE/OSCE. Narratives within the CSCE/OSCE can be understood as a representation of the ideas actors believe, which are not resigned to the institution, but rather underlie a variety of discourses actors construct. The CSCE/OSCE is

---

[42] Iggers 1999, 103.

[43] See: Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Humphreys, Brendan (2010): *Winter Kept us Warm: Cold War Interactions Reconsidered*. Aleksanteri Cold War Series 1. Bookwell Oy. Jyväskylä, Finland; Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Miklóssy, Katalin (2011): *Reassessing Cold War Europe*. Routledge Press, New York. http://www.helsinki.fi/aleksanteri/cwrg

[44] Miklóssy, Katalin (2011): The Cold War from a New Perspective. In: Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Miklóssy, Katalin (ed.) *Reassessing Cold War Europe*. Routledge Press, New York. 7-8.

[45] Cox, Michael (2008): Who won the Cold War in Europe. In: Bozo, Frederic; Rey, Marie-Pierre; Ludlow, N. Piers; Nuti, Leoplodo. (ed.) *Europe and the End of the Cold War: A Reappraisal*. New York, USA: Routledge Publishing, 9-19.

merely a useful repository where pieces of these narrative constructions have been archived. By looking at Nagorno-Karabakh as one section of the larger story, some of the trees (discourses) can be further examined to add to a larger investigation of the forest, which is the historiography of post-Cold War Europe.

1.4 Theory

Regional Security Complex Theory

This thesis will apply Buzan's and Waever's Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT). This theoretical frame will be applied to the relationship between Russia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, as well as other OSCE participating states, which do not necessarily have a regional interest in the Caucuses, but rather an interest in the OSCE as a security paradigm. RSCT will also help frame the discussion of a potential OSCE PKO and how Russia and various small states both interpreted and interacted with OSCE PKO planning throughout the OSCE's institutional evolution.

Buzan's and Waever's theory of RSCT is "a framework [for] organizing empirical studies of regional security."[46] From a historian's perspective, this theory is highly relevant for the following thesis because it is useful for writing structural history.[47] From a methodological perspective, it pairs nicely with HI because it gives further solidity for contemplating how various conceptions of security interacted within the CSCE/OSCE.

Buzan and Waever align their thought of structuralist studies within a constructivist school (Copenhagen School), similar to Alexander Wendt's ideas that the state is an actor who is given agency through those that represent its interests, such as diplomats.[48] Buzan and Waever, in a similar manner, look at how non-traditional security issues become securitized. The approach has clearly turned constructivist in the sense that it does not ask whether a certain issue is in and of itself a 'threat', but focus on the question of when and under what conditions who securitizes what issues. The act of labeling something a security issue – or a threat – transforms this issue and it is therefore in the political process of securitization that distinct security dynamics originate. "Thus, it is possible to formulate a

[46] Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever (2003): *Regions and Power: The Structures of International Security*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK. 51.
[47] Ibid., 52.
[48] Wendt 1999, 216.

theory that is not dogmatically state-centric in its premises, but is often somewhat state-centric in its findings."[49] The CSCE/OSCE is a primary research subject for this form of securitization for two reasons. The first being the different issues the CSCE/OSCE acknowledges as security questions. By having an institutional recognition of a wide array of issues that influence collective security, such as political-military (Basket I), environmental and economic (Basket II), and the human dimension (Basket III), it is easier for participating states to discuss all concerns as a corollary to securitization. Additionally, securitization occurs because of context, which here is interpreted to mean ideas. Narratives and ideas of European security are a driving factor in understanding why specific issues, such as OSCE intervention in the post-Soviet Space, became securitized at some historic moments, but not others. Buzan and Waever use terms such as penetration, meaning when an actor from outside the RSC infiltrates with their ideas, or overlay, when interests transcend mere penetration and change the patterns of local security norms.[50] In this analysis, these terms are closely associated with securitization and how Russia read initiatives of CSCE/OSCE participating states, as well as vis-a-versa.

RSCT consists of three main sets of interpretive variants. The first being the four levels of analysis to be looked at: 1) Domestic 2) state-to-state 3) region-to-region 4) role of global powers.[51] The second being the four variables that compose the essential structure of a Regional Security Complex (RSC):

1) Boundary, which differentiates the RSC from its neighbors
2) Anarchic structure, which means the RSC must be composed of two or more autonomous units
3) Polarity, which covers the distribution of power among the units
4) Social construction, which covers the patterns of amity and enmity among the units.

Finally, RSCT proposes three possible evolutions

1) Maintenance of the status quo, which means that there are no significant changes in its essential structure
2) Internal transformation, which means that changes in essential structure occur within the context of its existing outer boundary. This could mean changes to the anarchic structure (because of regional integration); to polarity (because of disintegration, merger, conquest, differential growth rates, or suchlike); or to the

[49] Buzan and Waever 2003, 71.
[50] Ibid., 61.
[51] Ibid., 51.

dominant patterns of amity/enmity (because of ideological shifts, war-weariness, changes of leadership, etc.)

3) External transformation, which means that the outer boundary expands or contracts, changing the membership of the RSC, and most probably transforming its essential structure ion other ways. The most obvious way for this to happen is if two RSCs merge.[52]

After setting this initial theoretical frame, Buzan and Weaver make the differentiation between different types of RSCs, or how a security complex is administered: standard RSCs, centered RSCs, great power RSCs, and supercomplexes. For the purpose of this analysis, only centered and supercomplexes will be relevant. Centered RSCs take four forms: superpower, great power, regional power, and institutional. The first two focus on uni-polarity, where a global level power dominates the region. Examples include the US in North America for a superpower centered RSC, and Russia in the CIS for a great power centered RSC. Regional power centered RSC have yet to exist and institutional centered RSC focus on regions that acquire 'actor level quality' through institutions, such as the EU. The other RSC of interest is supercomplexes, which are characterized as "strong interregional level of security dynamics arising from great power spillover into adjacent regions [defined by] East and South Asia."[53] Supercomplexes do not exist in the region of this thesis' analysis, but the supercomplex idea is useful in considering the idealism of a common European home and the subsequent conflict management structures, which certain actors attempted to construct around conflicts such as Nagorno-Karabakh.

Though this theory was presented in 2001, Russia can still be considered a centered RSC due to its continued predominance in the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and Eurasian Economic Union (EEU). All of these institutions and relations contain various securitized issues ranging from economics to hard security, which are still dependent on Russia as a center. These historic relationships and Russia's support for its near abroad, either through cheap energy or interconnectedness through migrant worker populations, builds further amity towards Russia as a security provider, and hence, a Russian centered RSC.

In the above structural terms of RSCT, the OSCE is a highly prevalent organization because it pushes RSCT further from the traditional top-down approach of viewing a post-

[52] Buzan and Waever 2003, 53.
[53] Ibid., 62.

Cold War security order.[54] As a non-state actor, the OSCE is an institution part of the EU institutional RSC, but also the Russian centered RSC. It was founded on an idealist vision to bridge the two RSCs. While the vision of creating a supercomplex may have been short lived during the 1990's, the mission of forming a type of inter-complex structure, somewhere between a centered RSC, institutional RSC, and supercomplex, remains. After this brief vision of a new security structure and shifting domestic politics in former Soviet states, many issues became further securitized, even the basic idea of 'Europe' agreed upon under Gorbachev.

Salience of Norms

In regards to norms, ideas, and institutional evolution, the supposition of Catherin Hecht is useful for discussing narratives based on normative commitments during liminal historic periods. Hecht argues that in multilateral organizations such as the CSCE/OSCE, "the practice of issuing restatements of prior commitments and reconsidering failed proposals contributed to agreements on the codification of new norms even during short windows of opportunity, particularly when recurring meetings enabled groundwork to be done in advance."[55] This can be taken as a commentary on the agreement of norms in 1975 in the Helsinki Final Act and the prolonged debate over the implementation of the three baskets throughout the conference's history. The eventual recodification of norms and expansion of the Helsinki Decalogue to negate the interpretation of 'sanctity of internal affairs' in 1991 is also read as a reassertion of norms, albeit a Western interpretation of original commitments. The reunification of Germany is also viewed in this light. The various reassertions of proposals by small states after 1989, while initially denied in the atmosphere of block politics from 1973-1989, came to be the foundation of the OSCE in the 1990's. Additionally, Hecht argues "re-endorsing or elaborating norms is significant in IOs with large, heterogeneous compositions, because high levels of support communicate norms' legitimacy, signal states' re-commitment, and convey broad expectations of compliance."[56] This conclusion will be applied to the discussion of OSCE institutional evolution. Conversely, by reaffirming the norms of Paris 1990, a specific narrative is

[54] Buzan and Waever 2003, 84-85.
[55] Hecht, Catherine (2016): Success after Stalemate? Persistence, Reiteration and Windows of Opportunity in Multilateral Negotiations. *Journal of International Organization Studies.* Vol 7. Is. 2. 36
[56] Ibid.

identified that sheds light on why OSCE involvement in Nagorno-Karabakh may have become further securitized and viewed as penetration by Russia.

Strategic culture

The pseudo-theoretical perspective of strategic culture also complements RSCT. While there are generally three generations of thought recognized in regards to strategic culture, this thesis will align with a form closest to the first generation, which focuses on the analysis of ideas. It is defined as: shared beliefs, norms or ideas within a society that generate expectations in security and defense policy. Thus, a society's security identity can be expressed through its behavioral patterns resulting from shared experiences and the accepted narratives of a security community. [57] This definition adds explanatory value to the argumentation asserting that the CSCE/OSCE evolved as a result of how actors viewed themselves within a European narrative. A look at how interaction within the CSCE either worked with or against self-perceptions of strategic culture, and hence their place in a larger European narrative after 1989, gives further figure to the questions of HI. It also gives another frame for understanding and analyzing how and why the CSCE/OSCE involved itself in the post-Soviet space, as well as why member states pursued a new Helsinki Decalogue for defining a common European strategic culture or collective memory.

That being said, strategic culture as a theoretical and analytical tool holds some ambiguity. It has undergone a variety of debate since its initial inception in 1970, retaining a certain amount of uncertainty in regards to its methodology, and hence explanatory power.[58] There is also uncertainty about how far back to look when considering cultural, political, and economic influence on strategic culture, leading to further ambiguity on what actually comprises strategic culture.[59] For example, when looking at Finland, Antti Seppo and Tuomas Forsberg comment that the positive self-perception of 'defense' in Finnish strategic culture stems from the heroic fight against the Soviet Union in 1930's and

---

[57] Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) (2013): *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 12

[58] Johnston, Alastair Iain (1995): Thinking about Strategic Culture *International Security.* Vol. 19, No. 4. 63.

[59] Jires, Jan (2010): Czech Republic. In: In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 69.

1940's.[60] Derek Fewster highlights similar tropes of defense stemming from the national Enlightenment period and the literary construction of ancient Finland as associated with self-defense.[61] Therefore, while the impact from these two discourses on 'defense' as a shared experience is similar, a more complex question of how researchers go about investigating strategic culture is raised. Do different forms of historical nationalism tell us different stories about strategic culture? Therefore, strategic culture is useful, but with the understanding that culture is a wide research focus and strategic culture is an open topic due to historiographical and mnemonic perspectives.

Memory

Strategic culture along with the discussion of 'Europe' allows for the contemplation of memory and narrative. The 'memory boom' and advent of history used by societies for nation building or rebuilding and regional integration that occurred in the 1990's is a highly relevant context for the narratives being surveyed in the thesis. Reconciling collective memory and critically reflecting on the past are seen as keys to European enlargement and the future of the EU.[62] While the EU only plays a contextual role in this study, the CSCE is part of a similar narrative of European integration. Understanding memory is significant in considering a new meaning of Europe after 'collective memory' was momentarily "liberated from constraints imposed by the need for state legitimation and the kind of friend-enemy thinking associated with the Cold War."[63] That being said, Małgorzata Parkier and Bo Stråth argue that the collective has no memory; it is only a conglomeration of individual memories.[64] Subsequently, the OSCE has no memory and is only a product of the individual conceptions of European security participating states imagined.

The euphoria that swept the continent in the early 1990's was associated with renewed political will, which attempted to redefine European security structures in

---

[60] Seppo, Antti, Tuomas Forsberg (2010): Finland. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 113.

[61] Fewster, Derek (2006): *Visions of Past Glory: Nationalism and the Construction of Early Finnish History.* Finnish Literature Society. Helsinki, Finland.

[62] Muller, Jan-Werner (2010): On 'European' Memory? In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 29

[63] Ibid., 31.

[64] Parkier and Stråth 2010, 6.

collective terms. Many of the support that went along with the memory construction of a 'common European home' was eventual offset by the alternative memory discourse of 'back to Europe'. Hence, competing memories of Europe as well as security eclipsed the initial memory politics that allowed narratives of the OSCE to momentarily coincide. Consequently, "the task of the historian is to contribute not to the construction of a national memory but to the deconstruction of the connected repertoire of myths."[65] Thus, an understanding of how memory and narrative within the OSCE overlap is significant in understanding how the OSCE as a security structure fits into the security identity of the various actors discussed in this thesis.

1.5 Remaining Chapters

The first section of analytical substance (section 2) will view the conflict within a longer historical discourse of a South Caucasian RSC. Section 3 will view the conflict from the perspective of the debate over a new Europe. Finally, section 4 will view the conflict from the perspective of CSCE/OSCE institutional evolution. By linking some of the regional (south Caucasus) and European wide political narrative of the 1990's with the OSCE institutional narrative, it can be seen how ideas of security interact on different levels. With specific focus on the OSCE, these levels illuminate how debates shifted forums within the CSCE/OSCE, as well as how different forums influenced the CSCE/OSCE's ability to implement a PKO in a shifting Russian centered South Caucasus RSC.

[65] Whitling, Frederick (2010): Damnatio Memoriae and the Power of Remembrance. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 89

2 Regional Security Complex – Openings

To understand how CSCE/OSCE involvement in the South Caucuses may have become securitized, Russia's historic position as a RSC center is significant. In relation to strategic culture, both actors recognize the significance of Russia in the region, as well as their need to maintain relatively good relations with their northern neighbor. The idea of Armenian and Azerbaijani nationalism and Russia's role in facilitating the process asserts is just one example of Russia as a historic RSC in the region. While the various complexities and nuances of nation building in the region cannot be adequately explained here, it is beneficial to acknowledge the established argument that Russia is a historic security provider in the region and a facilitator of both ethnic communities in their growth into the nation-state paradigm.[66] With this premise, an analysis of the contemporary period within a longer conception of Russia as a RSC center for the South Caucuses can be discussed.

These premises are also significant when considering strategic cultures in the region and how they began to shift towards the end of the Soviet period. The memories of Russia as providing stability is significant in observing a few ideas that may influence Armenia's and Azerbaijan's conception of strategic culture within a communist and imperial narrative. Senadin Musabegovic argues that while the communist body politic masked old forms of political legitimization, once communism collapsed, the nationalist body reappeared, as it had never truly left.[67] As such, strategic culture is based upon the legitimacy of a specific groups claim to nation-state status, and thus their need to defend this memory of legitimization. For Armenia and Azerbaijan, Russia is a critical part of these memories, with the communist and nationalist bodies intertwined, influencing how Russia is understood as a RSC center.

---

[66] See: Imranli-Lowe, Kamala (2015): Reconstruction of the 'Armenian Homeland' Notion. *Middle Eastern Studies*. Vol. 51 No.4. 540-562; Tölölyan, Khachig (2000): Elites and Institutions in the Armenian Transnation. *Diaspora*. Vol. 9 No. 1. 107-136; Demirtepe, Turgut and Laciner, Sedat (2004): Nationalism as an Instrument in a Socialist Foreign Policy: The Southern Azerbaijan Problem in Soviet-Iranian Relations. *The Review of International Affairs*. Vol. 3, No. 3. 443-457; Panossian, Razimk (2006): *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars*. Columbia University Press, New York; Suny, Ronald Grigor (2001): Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations. *The Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 73, No. 4. 862-896.

[67] Musabegovic, Senadin (2010): The Memory of the Dead Body. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 247-48.

It can be interpreted that Armenian strategic culture is highly dependent on the defense of its national body, which lives in the current nation-state container. The idea of survival and a securitized *Mentalites* among ethnic Armenians can be seen as a derivative of the national horrors of the Armenian Genocide, the various wars with Azerbaijan, and a significant Armenian diaspora around the world. These all compose noteworthy historic pieces of Armenian strategic culture and the need for a strong ally such as Russia to militarily defend national heritage. [68] Azerbaijan, however, does not have a national memory of the Soviets as saviors. Azeri nationalism and unity grew in a different trajectory than the Armenians, being often at odds with Soviet nationalist policies because of their Muslim heritage and Soviet fear of Iranian influence.[69] Consequently, while both the Azeri and Armenian national bodies were reawakened after the Soviet collapse, their memories of empire, nation, and territory influence the strategic culture they bring to conceptualizing a post-Soviet RSC.

While strategic culture is considered to be persistent, it is also considered changeable during windows of opportunity.[70] In relation to the NK War, the early 1990's can be considered such a period, with the perceived opportunity for change existing throughout Europe. The fluctuating interests for Russian support in the local conflict sent signals to the greater European and international community regarding the regions volatile security rules. These signals were interpreted in the wider narrative being conceived of a 'common European home' and the subsequent rules and norms based (Helsinki Decalogue) security structures that would result. The collapse of Soviet power in the South Caucuses influenced the plausibility of the CSCE as a primary conflict management institution. The expressed interest in new rules for a South Caucasus RSC led to mediation competition between CSCE/OSCE participating states and Russia. The use of international institutions such as the CSCE as leverage by Armenia and Azerbaijan in domestic political legitimization possibly influenced a narrative in which various OSCE initiatives were securitized in the future.

[68] Imranli-Lowe 2015, 541- 542; Tölölyan 2000, 119.
[69] Suny 2001, 872; Demirtepe and Laciner 2004, 444.
[70] Biehl; Giegerich; Jonas (ed.) 2013, 12

2.1 Nagorno-Karabakh War and its Implications

Nagorno-Karabakh was an autonomous oblast within the Soviet system. While the historical accounts of the region would be too detailed for this summary, the important piece to note is that for both Armenia and Azerbaijan, the region took on a specific significance with regards to the idea of a territorial nation-state identity in the interwar years, as well as after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Beginning in 1988, the NK conflict slowly escalated from ethnic violence and pogroms in Armenia and Azerbaijan. Increasing violence was a result of boiling tempers over the status of NK as an autonomous oblast. The majority ethnic Armenian population created local militias, mostly of farmers, called 'fedayin' and began supporting their own calls for independence. The conflict created chaos in both political systems and exhibited Gorbachev's inability to coherently present the USSR as a regional security provider. The USSR declared a state of emergency for the South Caucasus region in January 1990 after two years of increasing violence and pogroms. [71] The position of Soviet stability in the South Caucasus seemed fragile.

1991 was a tumultuous year for the Soviet Union and the war in Karabakh. It began with the implementation of 'Operation Ring' by the Soviet government. In theory, Operation Ring was supposed to support both the Armenian and Azerbaijani state organs. In reality, it gave the support of the Soviet military in the region to the Azerbaijani government. Operation Ring was a passport checking operation so that the Azerbaijani and Soviet governments could reassert control over the NK Autonomous Oblast.[72] The Soviet 4th Army ended up participating to suppress Armenian 'fedayin' who had become the main ethnic Armenian fighting force in the region. A form of partisan war ensued with continuous raids on villages and constant trafficking in human captives.[73]

In August of 1991 Gorbachev was confronted with a coup attempt by hardliners within the communist party and was eventually replaced by Boris Yeltsen. This was a blow for Azerbaijan because the local Soviet military units began to take on their own authority; many Soviet troops were prisoners at the time and freeing them became a priority over orders from Moscow.[74] The coup attempt also shifted Soviet focus, speeding up the

[71] De Waal 2013, 108.
[72] Ibid., 114.
[73] Ibid., 181.
[74] Ibid., 172.

disintegration of the union by further strengthening calls for national independence, and most importantly, left the Azerbaijani forces without the support of the Soviet Army. The Armenians had been able to slowly build up their forces through the capture of Soviet weapons and armor, while the Azerbaijanis had been largely dependent on Soviet support through Operation Ring.[75] Armenia declared independence from the USSR in September 1991 and Azerbaijan followed suite in November.

By the end of 1991 and during early 1992, Azerbaijani forces retained one last major town in Karabakh - Shusha. This was a strategic point, which if the Azerbaijanis could hold, would allow them to either negotiate peace or at least continue to fight. This final position of the Azerbaijani forces was paralleled by Iranian initiated peace efforts in early 1992. Following the internal turmoil of the August Coup in Russia, the newly born Russian Federation had neither the interest nor the strength to produce peace in the South Caucuses. That being said, the Iranians also had little success in filling the power vacuum the Soviet's had left. As peace talks proceeded in Tehran and a communiqué on the general conditions for a peace agreement was signed between Armenian President Ter-Petrosyan (president from 1991-1998) and Azerbaijani leader Yaqub Mamedov, Armenian forces attacked Shusha. Unbeknownst to Ter-Petrosyan, De Waal argues that this offensive highlighted the duplicity of military commanders that was seen in both countries. The potential peace was shattered and Iran ended efforts to mediate; the power vacuum was once again opened.[76]

Reported form of vigilante justice injected into the partisan war by Soviet troops following the August coup was outlined by Michael Mihalka in 1996. His commentary four years after the August coup shed light on the implications such actions had on the perception of Russian peacekeeping in the international community.[77] Because of this, international perceptions developed around the idea that Russia may no longer be the main security guarantor in the region. Such growing assumptions were also supported by Iran's efforts to mediate and Moscow's inability to produce peace in 1992, sustaining stability through a traditional Soviet RSC. There was uncertainty if the Russian Federation would be able to reassert control over the former Soviet RSC at all.

---

[75] De Waal 2013. 114.
[76] Ibid., 192-193.
[77] Mihalka 1996, 25.

1992 continued to be a turbulent year on the ground in NK. In May 1992 The Soviets agreed to transfer four divisions that were left in Transcaucasia to the individual states, with Armenia receiving one and a half to two of these divisions.[78] While on paper it seemed that the division of the Soviet remains was even, De Wall comments that firsthand accounts revealed a majority of the military agreements were made as a result of "'money, personal contacts and lots of vodka.'"[79] This again supported the perception of a mercenary characteristic in the escalating conflict, leading to allegations of Russians driving heavy armor for the Azerbaijani's in their summer 1992 offensive and subsequently the Armenian's convincing the Soviet Air Force to step in and stop the offensive.[80] Russian forces not only allegedly played a role in escalating the fighting from a partisan conflict to a 'normal' war, but the earlier arms transfer agreement neglected any maintenance or replacement parts. Therefore Phillip Peterson argues that the use of heavy weaponry by both sides was continually dependent on the Russian Federation.[81] While Russia may have lost the political power to influence the conflict in 1991, their material capabilities, though purportedly a mercenary force in 1992, had the ability to sustain influence over the political process for the coming years. Political elites from both nations understood that the support of the Russian military was needed for any decisive territorial victory. Neither wanted to accept the implications these alliances would have in the long term on sovereignty, strategic culture, or reconceptualization of a South Caucasus RSC

Abulfaz Elchibey, a former Azerbaijani dissident, won the Azeri presidency in June 1992, bringing the Azeri Popular Front of Azerbaijan movement (PFA) to power. The PFA was a contradiction in terms. They were for the retention of NK and the sanctity of what they perceived as the 'authentic' Azerbaijani homeland, but neglected to recognize that this was not possible without Russian arms. The fact that Azerbaijan was much more likely to publicly speak out against Russian involvement in the region, while also dependent on Russia to confront the Armenian 'fedayin', turned out to be a significant problem for the PFA. Like Armenia, the form of nationalism that came to legitimize new politicians such as Elchibey began the trend where NK was the primary key to internal political stability,

[78] Peterson, Phillip (1994): Security policy in Post-Soviet Transcaucasia. European Security. Vol.3 No. 1. 32-33.
[79] De Waal 2013, 211.
[80] Ibid., 209.
[81] Peterson 1994, 46.

consequently tying domestic political power to any RSC center.[82] Therefore, it was beneficial for Azerbaijani to support a RSC center aside from Russia because a Russian RSC would mean limited sovereignty.

After the high mark of the Azerbaijani offensive ended in October 1992, Armenia was poised to make a counter offensive the next year. March 1993 marked the beginning of a divergence within the Armenian leadership between those who wanted a diplomatic solution, and those that wants to resolve the issue militarily. In De Wall's account, President Ter-Petrosyan is characterized as continually looking for a diplomatic solution to the conflict, while only being partially informed by his military commanders of the complicity the Armenian military was to have in the spring offensive. Up until this point in the conflict, the Armenian military only supported the ethnic Armenian 'fedayin' secretly. The 1993 spring offensive largely succeeded and the relative easy of the Armenian operation motivated Moscow to put pressure on the new Azerbaijani government to accept peace as well as a Russian peacekeeping force.[83] The apparent presence of the Armenian military in the operation, as opposed to simply 'fedayin' fighters, along with allegations of participation from Russian 7th Army soldiers, led to the first official condemnation of the conflict by the United Nations on April 30th.[84] Armenian president Ter-Petrosyan worked to salvage his position by supporting a Russian-Armenian-Turkish peace plan. He gained an agreement from NK leaders in June of '93 in exchange for a concession that the agreement would only be implemented a month later, which turned out to be a politically advantageous concession. After the Armenian offensive the Azerbaijani PFA regime of Elchibey began to deteriorate and all peace agreements became void.

Though Elchibey gained his legitimacy through Azerbaijani military gains in '92, his young presidency was not able to reign in all its military commanders. Similar to the allegations of De Waal and Mihalka that Russian military commanders who took advantage of a faltering chain of command to gain their own wealth, the Azeri states monopoly on violence seemed to be progressing in the same direction. Commander Surat Husseinov was a leading figure in this regard and a growing political opponent of Elchibey following Azeri

---

[82] Özkan, Behul (2008): Who Gains from the "No War No Peace" Situation? A Critical Analysis of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. Geopolitics, Vol. 13. 593.

[83] De Waal 2013, 225.

[84] United Nations Security Council Resolution 822, April 30, 1993. Document Number: S/RES/822. United Nations Official Document System (UN-ODS) http://www.un.org/en/documents/index.html.

military defeats in NK. Elchibey did not have the resources to take on Husseinov, who was allegedly prepared to use women and children as human shields as well as weapons left by the Russian 104th Airborne division to march on Baku.[85] Elchibey looked for political options, eventually inviting former Azerbaijani KGB general and First Secretary of the Communist party of Azerbaijan, Haydar Aliev, to support the ailing government. Within four months, Aliev worked his way through parliament to direct a national referendum and a vote of no confidence on Elchibey, leading Aliev to the Presidency. This confrontation preoccupied Azerbaijan security forces with internal power struggles, allowing Armenian forces to take five regions of Azerbaijan or 20 present of Azerbaijan in four months.[86]

Vladimir Kazimirov, Russian Special Envoy for the NK conflict, produced a temporary cease-fire between August-September of 1993 while Azerbaijan was undergoing internal political chaos.[87] With Aliev elected in October of 1993, he began a duel strategy of negotiations with NK directly on the one hand and mass conscription of Azerbaijani youth after disbanding all units loyal to PFA on the other. Aliev had a clear political vision for his survival, which included warming relations with Moscow; prior to taking over the presidency, he signed a CIS accession agreement in September of '93. Fitting enough, Aliev began negotiations with Karabakh leader Robert Kocharian in Moscow at the Russian Foreign Minister's mansion. This produced a dialog that Vladimir Kazimirov had attempted to formulate on numerous occasions. The time for negotiation seemed to be ripening in line with mounting international consideration, seeing as the UN produced four Security Council resolutions by the end of 1993. One such resolution from October noted Armenian direct participation in the escalation of violence and urged the Armenian Government to "exert their influence to achieve compliance by the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh."[88] With international perceptions appearing to favor Azerbaijan, the former KGB general was prepared to play his hand.

---

[85] De Waal 2013, 226.

[86] Vilén, Heikki and Karie, Mike (1995): Preparations of a Peace-keeping Mission for the Na-gorono-Karahakh Conflict by the OSCE's High Level Planning Group (HLPG). *Journal of International Peacekeeping.* Vol. 2, Is. 5. 107.

[87] RFE/RL (2006): Nagorno-Karabakh: Timeline of the Long Road to Peace. *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty.* February 10, 2006. https://www.rferl.org/a/1065626.html (accessed July 31, 2017).

[88] United Nations Security Council Resolution 853. July 29 1993. Document Number: S/RES/853. United Nations Official Document System (UN-ODS) https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/428/34/IMG/N9342834.pdf?OpenElement. (accessed June 14, 2017).

Following the third UN Security Council resolution, Azerbaijan launches a new offensive in October, ten day after Aliev was formally elected president. The fragile ceasefire broke and NK Armenians expanded their area of control to the south. Two months later, the final portion of the war broke out, being fought mainly between the armies of Azerbaijan and Armenia.[89] This period of the war would not end until May 1994, with no peace agreement being formally signed

2.2 RSC Considerations

Newly found independence and Nagorno-Karabakh as a new legitimizing myth of nation gave opportunities for both Armenia and Azerbaijan to validate concerns they had about Russia as a mediator and security provider. It also offered a period of violent reflection on Russia's meaning for their respective, shifting, strategic cultures. Top officials from both Armenian and Azerbaijan agreed that "Russian troops should not assume the role of peacekeeping forces in Transcaucasia."[90] But while there was concern about the traditional security dynamic, both governments understood what a RSC center meant for individual sovereignty as well as the status of NK. As 1992 was a period of shifting legitimacy and consolidation in Azerbaijani and Armenia, the priority of internal political consolidation seemed more important than regional stability. Thus, the long narrative of 'no war no peace' and the power NK came to hold over internal politics in both countries evolved out of the advent of 'shopping around'. Both Azerbaijan and Armenia looked for a mediation form, and hence security provider, that offered the greatest room for internal maneuver among domestic political elites.[91]

In a set of 1992 interviews, the Armenia Deputy Foreign Minister Karine Kazinian mitigated the previous comments that Russian should not produce a PKO in the region by saying "to be frank, the UN is also not enough. Without Russian participation in the region, no solution is possible. Furthermore… excluding Russia from any solution only makes it suspicious and aggravates Russia."[92] With Armenia under a blockade from Azerbaijan and Turkey, heavily influencing the accessibility of basic resources such as electricity, Armenia understood that Russia was its only lifeline. While this materialized in support of Russian

[89] De Waal 2013, 239.
[90] Peterson 1994, 4.
[91] Özkan 2008, 575.
[92] Peterson 1994, 32.

resolutions in the CSCE and Minsk Group, interest in sustaining newly found sovereignty was also apparent.

Russian sway was suspected in the internal discontinuity between Armenian President Ter-Petrosyan and his military commanders. In his efforts to create regional stability, Ter-Petrosyan was contradicted multiple times by both the Armenian military and the leaders of NK. The offensive during the Iranian negotiations in early 1992 was one example and the extensive offensive in 1993 would be another. Though it cannot be said that Russia was constantly supporting Armenia, Armenian commanders possessed a sense of impunity that was not cultivated independently. For some analysts, this was considered the product of Russian military interest in seeing Armenian success in NK, causing increased pressure on Azerbaijan's PFA government to accept a Russian PKO.[93] Ter-Petrosyan understood that if domestic political consolidation was to be made, a resolution to the NK conflict would have to come first. Though Ter-Petrosyan made constant efforts to produce a durable peace, the questions of war in Karabakh began to emerge as the primary frame of Armenian domestic politics and possibly strategic culture. It seemed that the success of military actions worked to congeal the superiority of military resolutions to the conflict, as well as the necessity of Russia as a RSC center.

The fundamental necessity of Russia as a security guarantor and domestic political legitimizer was opposed, but simultaneously validated, by Azari officials. Speaker of Azri Parliament, Isa Kanberov, in 1992 commented "'our most important security objective is to liquidate the old colonial system and develop democratic values…while we work to eliminate the former colonel system, we must continue to take into consideration the interests of the Russian Federation.'"[94] Head of the International Organization department in the Azeri Ministry of Foreign Affairs Araz Beyukaga oglu Azimov also complicated this vision of coexistence by claiming "at this point in history, 'decentralized power is stronger than centralized power.'…[and] 'the three countries could satisfy their mutual security requirements without Russia.[95] While these comments may have been more emotional then based in reality, they present an image for the type of narrative Azerbaijan wanted to write.

[93] De Waal 2013, 249.
[94] Peterson 1994, 42.
[95] Ibid., 50.

While Azerbaijan had a troubled relationship with Russia due to ethnic and religious issues, it was in a position to gain support from other neighbors such as Turkey.[96] These relations led Azerbaijan to have loose considerations of Turkey as a security guarantor under the NATO umbrella.[97] The tension between Azerbaijan and Russia was also enflamed by Azeri officials such as speaker of Parliament Isa Kanberov, again asserting the need for alternative RSC centers. "Many people think that with the end of the Warsaw Pact the burden of NATO declined, but I disagree. Now the responsibility of maintaining peace and stability in Europe belongs exclusively with NATO."[98] The conflict continued to be exploited to solidify Azeri national autonomy from Russia. It also allowed Azerbaijan to capitalize on exhibiting its preference of leaving a Russian centered RSC, even though their survival, ability to take back NK, and legitimize domestic political power still largely depended on Russian force.

As discussed above, the shifting internal politics, war, and potential for a new security arrangement show a shift, if only momentary, in strategic culture. The question of Russia as a RSC was ever-present throughout the NK conflict and set the stage for OSCE conflict management interest. The CSCE was able to make large steps in regards to conflict management during 1992 and will be further discussed in the next chapter. Due to the incomplete nature of CSCE institutional construction, it allowed for the countries within the Transcaucasia RSC to exacerbate the rivalry between Russia and other CSCE participating states for military and political gain.

[96] Demirtepe and Laciner 2004, 443.
[97] Peterson 1994, 51.
[98] Ibid., 55.

3 Mediation Competition

"Yet everyone was aware that without a firm commitment from the CSCE to provide a force promptly no agreement was possible, because the parties knew a ceasefire would not last unless outsiders were present to supervise it."

John J. Maresca 1996[99]

With regard to the commitments of small states, the next two chapters will flesh out Nünlist's assertions presented in the introduction. This chapter refocuses on the historic moment of 1990-1994. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the CSCE/OSCE during these four years was aptly described "as the sole pan-European structure, [which] had the important task of managing the changes that followed that epochal event."[100] This moment of high, but fluctuating political will and ambition in the European community signaled a period when small states were able to achieve further gains in regards to an institutionalized security vision of a collective Europe, similar to the Helsinki Process 1973-1975 and Stockholm 1983-1985.[101] This assertion will be presented through the narrative of a right to mediate the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the subsequent PKO debates. Small states such as Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Finland took substantial roles in this process. Before the gap began to close in 1995, additional small states who were fundamental throughout the CSCE process, such as Switzerland, Romania, Poland, etc. continued to support these goals.[102] These actors worked against the disengagement or pro-NATO policy of the US and the uncertain foreign policy of the Russian Federation. This period was also the opening of a 'back to Europe' rhetoric setting the stage for the future clash with the 'common European home' ideology.

---

[99] Maresca 1996, 483.

[100] Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (1997): Conclusions and Perspectives. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 511.

[101] See: McDonagh, Philip (1987): The Strengthening of Security in Europe: The Stockholm Conference, 1984-86. *Irish Studies in International Affairs.* Vol. 2, No. 3. 79-97; Freeman, John (1992): *Security and the CSCE Process: The Stockholm Conference and Beyond*. Royal United Service Institute. Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD. London, UK; Maresca 1985.

[102] See: Miklóssy, Katalin (2010): New Advantages of Old Kinship Ties: Finnish-Hungarian interactions in the 1970's. In: Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Humphreys, Brendan (ed.) *Winter Kept us Warm: Cold War Interactions Reconsidered*. Bookwell Oy. Jyväskylä, Finland; Fischer, Thomas (2009): *Neutral Power in the CSCE: The N+N States and the Making of the Helsinki Accords 1975*. Austrian Institute for International Affairs. Normos Publishing. Germany. 330; Nünlist, Christian (2015): Successful Small States in the OSCE and the German Chairmanship of 2016. *Security and Human Rights.* Vol. 26. Is. 1. 50-51; Freeman 1992, 41.

This entrance of 'back to Europe' can be seen as an attempt to influence the memory politics that opened after the collapse of communism. It also impacted Russia's hope that a 'common European home' collective memory might absolve it of difficult reconciliation after the collapse of empire. Former WP states in turn looked to associate with European structures, neglecting deep reconciliation, as they had always been a part of 'Europe', albeit with a half century of occupation. These memories are influential factors in narrative construction within the CSCE, as well as actors' perception of the CSCE as a sufficient holder and legitimizer of said narrative in relation to security during the 1990's.

3.1 CSCE Memories

The CSCE's growth out of the post-WWII environment along with the hopes and aspirations of individual states in 1990 painted a picture of independent actors, albeit at times restrained by the lethargy of history or memory of strategic culture. Within this longer historical recollection, it is significant to present the individual memory and interpretation different actors associate with the CSCE. John Freeman, a British diplomat, noted prior to 1990 that:

> The NNA [N+N] group was more ambitious than either of the two military alliances. As individual delegations and also as a group they showed themselves anxious to make progress on military aspects of security. It is perhaps too easy to overlook the fact that unlike the military alliances the opportunities for the neutral and non-aligned states to influence negotiated security outcomes was very limited. But their national security was usually very much influenced by, if not actually dependent upon East-West 'conflict'. The level of military forces – and their sometimes nuclear character- directly impinged upon their sense or absence of security… The NNA were to play an important role in discussions of security at all relevant CSCE meetings.[103]

This presentation of the N+N states and other individualistic actors, gives a special character to and memory of the CSCE that may not always be present in traditional accounts of the Cold War. As presented in the introduction, other actors such as Maresca may have considered themselves acting out great power politics. Maresca sums up his bias with the comment that "the key issues in multilateral negotiations are always destined to be negotiated by great powers, and any resulting agreements are destined to be hammered out between them."[104] He presented this opinion in relation to Kissinger's ability to negotiate the peaceful changes of frontiers, which would eventually allow for the reunification and

[103] Freeman 1992, 65.
[104] Maresca 1985, Xii.

NATO membership of East Germany, as well as further human rights concessions by the USSR. While from a particular reading of history he is not wrong, as this thesis will argue, the viewpoint discounts the efforts of small actors and the ability they have in creating an environment where agreements can be made. The parallel interpretation of the past is presented by Thomas Fisher, who states that the CSCE was

> the only moment in European Cold War history when neutral and non-aligned states played a decisive role in multilateral diplomacy.
> …
> The European security conference provided these states with a unique opportunity to activate their foreign policy in a multilateral context and to improve their international standing, and with their participation in the CSCE, the neutrals and non-aligned states changed their position definitively from object to subject in European Cold War affairs.[105]

The dichotomy presented by these interpretations is palpable and highly parallel to the study being laid out here. While both Maresca and Freeman experienced the CSCE first hand as actors, they selectively remember different aspects of the conference as paramount to its significance. They write their actions into different narratives, and thus influence the story they choose to write for the future. This microcosm can also be seen in the activeness different states took during the 1990's in response to their previous success in the organization and how it coincides with said actor's strategic culture.

While 1990 is not the start point for diverging historic memories, it is a point of conceptualization of potential European politics outside the block to block paradigm. The 1990's offered an opening for a greater realization of independent narrative construction aided by the 'memory boom'. The ability to influence memory politics for the new image of nation springing out of the communist collapse was also being grasped. The account of Nagorno-Karabakh mediation will be analyzed with this longer temporal frame in mind, looking back on CSCE experiences to consider how the organization fits into individual states' strategic culture as well as perceptions of the future as a derivative of narrative and memory.

3.2 Towards a Collective Memory?

The Charter of Paris, signed in November 1990, was a formidable moment in the CSCE's evolution and post-Cold War history. It was an initial step in constructing a new

[105] Fischer 2009, 17-18.

collective security memory insomuch as it presented a seemingly uncontroversial vision of the future. Commentators at the time noted, "those who seek in the Charter of Paris a blueprint for a new political order in Europe will be disappointed. The most significant accomplishments are clearly the commitments to democracy and the rule of law."[106] On the contrary, the reunification of Germany earlier that year, as well as new agreements on a common interpretation of respect for human rights and the rule of law showed strides toward a collective memory due the enmity these issues caused over the past half century.

In line with these debates and Gorbachev's position of showing Europe that the Soviets were a "civilized European nation,"[107] the USSR offered to host the CSCE Human Dimension meeting in Moscow during 1991. The concluding document of this meeting stated that human rights could no longer be denied by the principle of 'non-intervention in internal affairs'.[108] This reinterpretation of the Helsinki Decalogue principle of 'none interference in internal affairs' first in relation to human rights and later in relation to the political-military dimension, became the foundation for a new definition of Europe.[109] This was a vital renegotiation of the Helsinki Decalogue and a potential sign for a common European narrative. That being said, these agreements also became a point of ideological opposition in a post-Gorbachev Russian narrative. This exhibits that by neglecting to acknowledge that Soviet memory was not in line with Western memory, a new collective memory based on Western perceptions was no basis for future attunement.

As the traditional vision of the CSCE was in euphoric crisis, it seemed that some actors wanted to forget the negative aspects of original block politics, but retain the position of power associated with such a system. Thus, the predictability of negotiating positions that went along with more stable identity and memory politics disappeared. The US pushed for continued progress on CBMs with a new Conventional Forces in Europe treaty (CFE), attempting to use arms control to safeguard stability at a time of tumultuous political change.[110] Europeans hoped that "only a CSCE with a renewed agenda and with a solid

---

[106] Lehne 1991, 30.
[107] Savranskaya, *Svetlana.* (2008): In the Name of Europe: Soviet Withdrawal from Eastern Europe. In: Bozo *Europe and the End of the Cold War: A reappraisal.* Routledge Publishing. New York, USA. 45.
[108] Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE. October 3, 1991. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/14310. (accessed May 3, 2018). 29
[109] Bloed, Arie (2014): OSCE Principles: Which Principles? *Security and Human Rights*. Vol. 25. 215-216.
[110] Lehne 1991, 22.

structural base [could] serve as an effective instrument for the 'reunification' of Europe."[111] Some commentators within the soon to be independent Russia saw the CSCE as their last chance to remain within a European framework. This caused the basis for growing political infighting within the Russia elite, partially due to Gorbachev's 'radicalism', in response to the belief that they had been cheated out of Germany and other areas a Russian sphere of influence was entitled to.[112] The Helsinki principles were originally written with double meaning to accommodate a variety of narratives and ideas of Europe. When formal agreements began to drift toward the Western interpretation after 1991, specifically the idea of human rights and the abdication of sanctity of internal affairs, only part of Russia was in agreement. While a perceived common narrative was part of the euphoria of the early 1990's, new forums for interaction would prove otherwise.

Within this context of memory, narrative, and new European security architecture, there was the fundamental question of what responsibility the CSCE had in regards to emerging post-Soviet conflicts. As the only regional organization including all nation states from the European continent and post-Soviet space (after January 1992), the CSCE was a logical choice for common action. The 1990-1991 period also lent itself to the CSCE as a forum for embodying new hopes, pushing small states to support such visions as the CSCE had come to align with their strategic cultures.

3.3 The Meaning of New European Security in Practice

The initial effects of these new narratives on the Nagorno-Karabakh mediation discourse took shape in 1992 when all former Soviet republics were admitted to the CSCE and various conflicts broke out in the former Soviet Space. The first mention of the CSCE taking on a harder role in conflict management in a formal text was at the second CSCE Senior Council in Prague, January 1992. The concluding document briefly mentioned that the Helsinki follow-up meeting to be held later that year should "give careful consideration to possibilities for CSCE peacekeeping or a CSCE role in peacekeeping."[113] Internally, the

---

[111] Lehne 1991, 16.

[112] Sarotte, Mary Elise (2010): *1989: The Struggle to Create Post-Cold War Europe*. Princeton University Press, USA. 228.

[113] Prague Document on Further Development of CSCE Institutions and Structures; Declaration on Non-Proliferation and Arms Transfers. Second Meeting of the Council; Summary of Conclusions. Prague, Czechoslovakia, January 30-31, 1992. Document Number: 2PRAG92.e. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL https://www.osce.org/mc/40270. (accessed June 35, 2017).

idea of a CSCE PKO was being discussed and supported by various Nordic countries, Canada, and some Central and Eastern European members.[114] Following Iran's attempts in February to mediate the NK conflict, the CSCE began planning the opening of a peace conference in Minsk the next month, organized by the Minsk Group.[115] Established in 1992, the Minsk Group was as a preparatory conference for negotiations on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and was eventually given a formal mandate at the 1994 Budapest Summit. This hybrid conference planning organ and political medium became the OSCE's main forum for facilitating dialogue between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The efforts of Tehran to mediate the growing conflict worried both Russia and the CSCE, focusing international attention on the region as well as on the CSCE PKO debate.[116]

De Wall interprets this historic moment, when the CSCE decided to explore mediation options regarding NK, selectively, quoting Maresca's mnemonic documentation:

> It began, in the words of one of those present, 'almost as an afterthought' at the end of a meeting in Prague on 31 January 1992, at which most of the former Soviet republics were admitted to the organization. As the meeting was winding up. The British delegate pointed out that the organization had just admitted two members, Armenia and Azerbaijan, who were at war with each other and that the CSCE was obliged to do something about it. A CSCE fact-finding mission was dispatched to the region.[117]

While this is a direct quote from an earlier account by Maresca, De Wall takes it out of context and disregards the qualifying interpretation Maresca offers. In Maresca's original account, in the same paragraph where De Wall gains the above information, Maresca went on to mention that:

> By the time the warring sides and the issues which separated them had been largely defined. The challenge for the international community was thus neither one of foreseeing the conflict nor of preventing it from becoming violent. From the outset

---

[114] Ronzitti, Natalino (1997): OSCE Peace-Keeping. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 238.

[115] CSCE Secretary General, Annual Report 1993 on CSCE Activities. Office of the Secretary General. Vienna, Austria. OSCE Open. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[116] Hopmann, Terrence and Zartman, William (ed.) (2013): *Nagorno Karabakh: Understanding Conflict 2013 Conflict Management Program Student Field Trip to the Region*. John Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies. Washington D.C. https://www.sais-jhu.edu/sites/default/files/CM%20Field%20Trip%20NK%20March%2029%20Final_1.pdf. (accessed August 1, 2017) 140.

[117] De Waal, Thomas 2013, 241.

> of its involvement, the problems which the international community faced were those of conflict resolution and reconciliation.[118]

This second part of the quote is pivotal in understanding how the international community approached the NK conflict. The initiations at Prague were in preparation for higher level CSCE meetings later that year where more substantial mandates could be considered. The context of Prague was that of a meeting tasked with preparing institutional options to be explored prior to the Helsinki Summit in July 1992, as well as the Ministerial Council in Stockholm, December 1992. Therefore, Prague '92 was less of an 'afterthought' and more of a preparatory measure for one of the OSCE's longest institutional commitments.

Additionally, Maresca goes further to contextualize the CSCE decision in a form of practical knowledge and memory, saying that very few Western countries had any diplomats with knowledge of former Soviet Union Republics. Even the Russian Foreign Ministry was largely uninformed of the history and politics that developed within its own borders during the time of the Soviet Union.[119] Thus, from Maresca's account, the fact that most participating states were largely uninformed about Nagorno-Karabakh and that the CSCE inherited a variety of new conflicts with the accession of the former Soviet Union Republics, NK may not have seemed like a necessary issue to address in preventing war. Though the account De Wall presents is one of the most comprehensive on the NK conflict itself, his interpretation of the mediation aspects seems to be read through the lens of the regional conflict, rather than the lens of a jubilant post-Cold War Europe. In adding this contextual caveat, it can also be interpreted that most state level actors were yet to fully understand Armenia and Azerbaijan outside the context of the 'communist body' mentioned in chapter one. As the new national body was not understood, shifting strategic cultures in the region weren't either. This set the initial frame for how CSCE initiatives entered a South Caucasian RSC, where many of the variables were continually shifting.

Whereas the diplomatic aesthetics of Prague may have been considered an afterthought, the CSCE's actions that followed were much less so. Within twelve days of the Prague Meeting of Senior Officials, the CSCE fielded a fact-finding mission to Armenia and Azerbaijan to confirm their "admission" status to the CSCE, but also to assess the situation in NK. This mission, produced by the Czechoslovak CiO and led by Czechoslovak

---

[118] Maresca 1996, 475.
[119] Ibid.

Ambassador Karel Schwarzenberg, was the first CSCE mission with a quota of military offices.[120] Following the Helsinki II mandate in July '92, the idea of military involvement in CSCE missions gained an official status with the PKO mandate. Later that year, the Initial Operation Planning Group (IOPG) and predecessor to the HLPG, was formed to consider how the Helsinki II mandate could be applied to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.[121] The initiative of the IOPG was led by Swedish Major-General Bergh. He prepared the stage for continued direction by Sweden in 1993-1994 and setting the tone for small state leadership in CSCE mediation of NK.[122] Thus the afterthought of Prague set in motion an institutional evolution and mandate that was closely tied to NK.

The leadership of Czechoslovakia at this juncture in the CSCE evolution is significant in contemplating strategic culture. Though Czechoslovakia took the CSCE chairmanship in 1993 and hosted the first CSCE secretariat before it was moved to its permanent home in Vienna, the Velvet Divorce and other factors would cause the strategic culture of the new nation to grapple with the emerging memory of communism. Jan Jires, for example, describes Czech strategic culture as highly supportive of international peacekeeping, conflict management, and out of region involvement – all visions of a young CSCE. But in his analysis of Czech security documents, Jires clearly shows these goals as a means for achieving the image of "a responsible member of the Western security community."[123] While there are mentions of various different foreign policy schools within Czech politics, they all align with this internationalist view, which contemporary analysts see as validated through NATO and EU membership.[124] The CSCE discourse presented here further colors said goals as a form of post-Soviet security-identity formation achieved through the CSCE. After the 1990 CSCE Paris document, where no grand strategy appeared, but rather only idealist hopes, a future security community with Russia without legal or material guaranties of safety may have conjured up negative memories of the

---

[120] Höynck, Wilhelm (1994): CSCE Missions in the Field as an Interment of Preventative Diplomacy – Their Origin and Development. In: Carlsson, Staffan (ed.) *The Challenges of Preventative Diplomacy: The Experience of the CSCE.* Norstedts Tryckeri AB, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm. 61.

[121] Vilén and Karie 1995, 107.

[122] Höynck 1994, 62.

[123] Jires 2010, 72-74.

[124] See: Kratochvíl, Petr and Věra Řiháčková (2015): Domestic political context since 1989: Russia as a dividing element in Czech society. In: Kucharczyk, Jacek and Mesežnikov, Grigorij (ed.) *Diverging Voices, Converging Policies: The Visegrad States' Reactions to the Russia-Ukraine Conflict.* Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Warsaw. 14-25; Jires 2010, 69-83.

communist past. As stated by Klas-göran Karlasson, "an existential use of history is triggered by the need to remember, or alternatively to forget, in order to uphold or intensify feelings of orientation and identity in a society characterized by insecurity, pressure or sudden change."[125] The increasing rhetoric of 'back to Europe', which embodied Vaclav Havel and the Civic Forum movement in 1990 Czechoslovak elections, formed into a social and security memory that provided a incantation of the Europe Czechoslovakia had once been a part of prior to the WP. Though Czechia would be the CSCE chairman after the Velvet Divorce in 1993, troop contributions to NATO began in 1995 with membership in 1999.[126] Collective security was also a term loaded with memory. For collective security to mean security with Russia, Czechia would have to assess its communist past and events such as the WP invasion in 1968. It seems that the alternative was chosen and a 'common European home' could not be synonymous with security if Russia was a member.

Swedish leadership on the other hand, fits into a longer narrative of achieving strategic aims through the CSCE. Swedish identity has been closely tied with neutrality throughout history, but the meaning of which has changed depending on society, elites, and historical context. According to Chiara Ruffa the underlying self-image of Sweden as a force for good in the world remained constant, pushing the nation to support international peacekeeping operations and a preference for non-use of force. An early example of this in the CSCE process was when the Swedish delegation, at the 1973-75 Geneva planning meetings, pushed for the norm of transparency, requesting disclosure of all member states military budgets. Though this died due to Soviet opposition, disclosure of military budgets is a key CBM today. [127] Sweden also hosted the 1984-86 Stockholm Disarmament Conference. This validated the CSCE process as an arms control forum where all participating states had a voice, rather than the bilateral arms negotiations the US preferred.

In the immediate post-Cold War period, in a shifting moment, Swedish strategic culture seemed to be drifting towards support for a multilateral, norms based European

[125] Karlasson, Klas-Goran (2010): The Use of History in the Third Wave of Europeanization. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 46.
[126] Jires 2010, 74.
[127] Freeman 1992, 71.

order, where there would be the opportunity "to change the world to fit Swedish ideals."[128] The commitment of Sweden to new CSCE missions and the possibility of a CSCE PKO reflected this vision in the 1990's. Sweden too, one of the staunchest supporters of the CSCE, became enticed by NATO cooperation. In policy documents Sweden named the UN as the primary international arena for PKO support and as early as 2002 defined NATO as the true provider of European Security.[129] Though Sweden clearly drifted away from the early commitments of the CSCE as a way of effectively shaping the world in the image of Swedish ideals, the commitments remain today. "The Law on Armed Forces for Service Abroad" allows Sweden to deploy up to 3,000 peacekeepers internationally, specifically mentioning UN and OSCE PKO missions, without the approval of parliament.[130] While this does not allow peace enforcement operations (use of force), it clearly retains the spirit of the CSCE/OSCE PKO debate outlined here.

3.4 Concrete Steps

Following the March 1992 initiatives and the founding of the Minsk Group, Italy as the first Minsk Group chair organized emergency meetings in Rome. Known as the Villa Madama meetings, these talks which began in the summer of 1992, offered an alternative to the existing Russian mediation.[131] These efforts were an attempt to facilitate mediation with the political networks of the CSCE, while simultaneously endeavoring to present a forum with limited institutional political interests.[132] The idea to hold a separate Minsk Conference was a way to produce a mediation track facilitated by the CSCE, though still independent from the organization.[133]

In these Rome preliminary meetings, Russian presented an interest in retaining a principal conflict mediation position. The Russia Federation was concerned with hard military measures as well as exclusive rights to managing and mediating a ceasefire. This

---

[128] Ruffa, Chiara (2010) Sweden. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 343-344.
[129] Ibid., 349
[130] Ibid., 347.
[131] Emergency Preliminary Meetings of the Minsk Group of the CSCE. Second Session, Third Day. Villa Madama, Rome, Italy. June 17, 1992. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.
[132] Af Ugglas 1994, 24.
[133] Mihalka, Michael (1996): A Marriage of Convenience: The OSCE and Russia in Nagorny-Karabakh and Chechnya. *Helsinki Monitor.* Vol. 7, No. 13. 17.

sentiment was supported in a joint Russian/Armenian draft proposal from 18 June 1992.[134] Azerbaijan countered with an alternative proposal, requesting that the UN or CSCE administer any potential "peace-making" force.[135] In doing so, Azerbaijan asserted its new independent foreign policy and further opening the door for and alternative security arrangement in the region. Both the Russian interest and the idea of peace-making can be seen in opposition to the Swedish strategic values of non-use of force. This was significant as Sweden began to actively take on leadership of its own in the NK mediation framework. While still early in the 1990's, these debates, along with journalistic accounts of ongoing Russian peacekeeping efforts in the post-Soviet space, formed a foundation for future assertions that Russian peacekeeping was not palatable for a new, value based Europe. An evolving CSCE PKO also became a symbol for wider OSCE involvement, and hence, a deeper securitization of values by Russia.[136] As an immediate response to the concern of all parties, the decision was made to recommend Mr. Heikki Juhani Happonen of Finland as the head of a CSCE Advanced Monitoring Group.[137]

It is visible from the recorded statements at the 1992 Rome preliminary meetings that the initial issue in the conflict resolution process stemmed from who would maintain peace within the post-Soviet space in the new emerging international order. Russia showed that due to internal consternation over the past three years, it had not been unable to quell the partisan violence and maintain stability in the region. This led Russia to seek other forums for reasserting regional security, such as backing from the UN or CSCE, but only in terms of financial support and additional troops that Russia could command. With the donation of staff and effort to facilitate international mediation networks from states such as Sweden, Finland, and Czechoslovakia, the CSCE's voice was amplified, so as to support any say the bourgeoning institution might have in the peace process.

---

[134] Emergency Preliminary Meetings of the Minsk Group of the CSCE. Second Session, Third Day. OSCE Restricted.

[135] Ibid.

[136] See: Davies, Lance (2015): Russian Institution Learning and Regional Peace Operations: The Case of Georgia and Moldova. *Camillas Jounral of International Relations.* May-August 2015 Issue; Davies Lance (2017): Searching for Security in the South Caucasus: Russia and Western Regional Security Mechanisms, 2000-2016 *Cascade: Exploring the Security-Democracy Nexus in the Caucasus.* European Union Seventh Framework Programme.

[137] Emergency Preliminary Meetings of the Minsk Group of the CSCE. Second Session, Third Day. OSCE Restricted.

The position of Finland as a bridge in conflict resolution was a position they readily played throughout the CSCE process. Examples include Finnish Ambassador Ralph Enckell, who effectively navigated Russia's interest in having Finland propose and organize an all European security conference in the 1960's. For Fisher, Enckell effectively spread the gospel of a CSCE while feigning to promote the conference on Moscow's terms, simultaneously fortifying Finland's neutrality as an "indispensable precondition to the conference."[138] The image grew when the presidents of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic shook hands for the first time at Dipoli Conference Hall in Espoo, Finland. This created a significant image of Finland as an actor who could facilitate progress on issues such as the German question, which was one of the largest sources of enmity in Cold War Europe.[139] In the words of Finnish diplomat Jaakko Iloniemi, "the mere initiative was in itself a strong political signal of Finland's will and ability to operate constructively in the European field of tensions."[140]

This identity as a bridge can also be understood as a form of leadership in sustaining the CSCE and creating room for other actors. One small proposal by the Finns on follow-up meetings after the initial 1973-1975 period of negotiations was agreed upon in 1975, achieving commitments for a continuation of the CSCE process.[141] Hungary and Romania were strong supporters of the Finns proposal for follow-up meetings, even though Moscow and Washington were strongly against the CSCE continuing past a 1975 summit.[142] These follow-up meetings came to define the CSCE process. In Stockholm 1984-1986 at the final CSCE disarmament negotiation conference of the Cold War, which the Soviets had been asking for since 1977, the perennial issue of negotiations on exchange of military information came to a standstill as it had in Geneva '74. Only after efforts from the Finnish ambassador was the gap bridged, first by obtaining a tacit acceptance of ambiguous wording on the exchange of military information to get the parties to a final document.[143] The narrative Finland wrote in regards to the CSCE was a narrative of empowerment. New

---

[138] Fischer 2009, 100,112.
[139] Lindström, Mirva (2006): Towards a New Europe. *Finland's Goals in the CSCE*. Suomen Ulkominiseriö. file:///C:/Users/breynold/Downloads/Etyk_eng.pdf. (accessed 13.7.2017). 3.
[140] Iloniemi, Jaakko (2006): *Finland's Goals in the CSCE*. Suomen Ulkominiseriö. file:///C:/Users/breynold/Downloads/Etyk_eng.pdf. (accessed 13.7.2017). 1.
[141] Ibid., 2.
[142] Miklóssy 2010, 143.
[143] Freeman 1992, 102.

responsibilities undertaken in regard to the NK conflict can be understood as part of a longer conceptualization of the image and security Finland wanted to achieve.

The position Finland took up in the early stages of CSCE proposals for mediation of the NK conflict, similar to Sweden, also reflected a longer idea of strategic culture. Finland, more than Sweden considered the CSCE as a critical component of its identity as Finland gained substantially in international and self-image with the successful Final Act in 1975 (which, many thought would never happen). While Sweden looked to influence a value-based order, Antti Seppo and Tuomas Forsberg argue the old Kekkonen mantra still prevails in Finland. That being Finland should be a physician rather than a judge in international conflicts. Yet while Finland has a strategic commitment to détente and a rules based European security architecture, after 1975 "the national reading of the CSCE developed, again, more towards the latter at the cost of the former."[144] Both readings can be seen in the 1990's, but the unfolding of this dichotomy is also present in Finnish leadership of OSCE mediation of the NK conflict. Irrespective, the CSCE/OSCE remained in line with idealist aspects of Finnish strategic culture, allowing for the assumption of a "self-image as a country that is active in and capable of peacekeeping and peace-mediating."[145] This self-image, pursued through the CSCE process, also interacted with Kari Möttölä's argumentation that "Russia has a role in the Finnish narrative, not only as a great-power neighbor, but also as a key factor in the unification or division of Europe at large."[146] In sum, Finnish commitment to the CSCE remained throughout the period of analysis and beyond, as the need for compromise and discussion has often been referred to as the need to invoke the spirit of Helsinki.

3.5 Russia's Shifting Strategic Culture and the CSCE

The debate over what role the CSCE should take continued to play out, with the various camps established in 1991 preparing for the Helsinki Summit of 1992, or Helsinki II. Lehne describes the two main visions of the CSCE during this period as composed of those who were in favor of more security dialogue within the Conflict Prevention Center

[144] Seppo and Forsberg 2010, 115.
[145] Ibid., 122.
[146] Möttölä, Kari (2017): Finland Between the Practice and the Idea: The Significance and Change of Narrative in the Post-Cold War Era. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 14.

(CPC- chapter three) and those who favored more arms control measures and a wider institutional identity.[147] As most emerging conflicts were in the post-Soviet space, relations with Russia became a pivotal point of defining any CSCE conflict mediation role. While not wanting to leave Russia on the periphery of post-Cold War politics, CSCE participating states still held "uncertainty about how to handle Russia's interests in the CIS."[148] Russia remained the primary security guarantor in the post-Soviet space, even as the Soviet RSC deteriorated and other states such as Iran momentarily attempted to fill the void.

In terms of Russian strategic culture, it was unclear how a new Russia would define security and if old imperial notions of identity would remain. While many Western leaders saw Gorbachev's initiatives and commitments to a revised Helsinki Decalogue as an opportunity to create a common European definition of security, internal issues within Russia came to dictate otherwise. Liz Fuller argues that an alteration occurred during the course of 1992 in Russian, military-security politics, shifting from an Atlanticist perspective to Eurasian Realism. This shift allegedly placed greater importance on Turkey and Iran rather than Europe. Fuller outlines domestic discourse in Russia to elucidate this point, showing that the fear of a Caucasus without Russia would lead to Turkey as a regional super power comparable to Russia.[149] This fear exhibits that even after the Soviet collapse, the post-Soviet space, or at least the Caucasus as a Russian security complex was still seen as a significant part of Russian identity and memory, materializing in popular media and official documents.

Such a growing fear was contextualized with the founding of the Collective Security Treaty in Tashkent, May 1992. This produced a debate of how to define the former Soviet Transcaucasus Military District. With some talk of relinquishing Russian oversight under the guise of the CIS, Colonel-General Valerii Patrikeev temporarily settled the matter in an interview with TASS, commenting that Russian jurisdiction would remain. In March, the Russian parliament requested Armenia and Georgia enter talks to define the status of Russian troops on their territory, followed by new recommendations from Russia that they should construct a new collective security structure in the region. Roy Allison contends that

---

[147] Lehne 1991, 64.
[148] Dehdashti 1997, 465.
[149] Fuller, Elizabeth (1994): *Russian Strategy in the Transcaucasus since the Demise of the USSR.* Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studie. Cologne, Germany. 7

these regional developments were partially driven by a personal interest on the part of the armed forces to define the South Caucasus and Black Sea Coast as fundamental to Russian Security. A caucus of military officials developed in the early 1990's with the goal of securing Russian interests in the 'near-abroad'.[150] These developments in internal Russian security discussions contradicted many of Gorbachev's initiatives. They also exhibited the fragile nature of Russian security identity, the uncertainty of the shift from a Soviet to Russian strategic culture, and if there would be any real shift at all.

Confusion of how to consider a new Russian state and what role the CSCE should play in conflict management were influential issues for the evolving PKO debate. Further considered at Helsinki in July of 1992 following the Azeri offensive, Helsinki II expanded the language on peacekeeping and was the initial mandate for all future peacekeeping debates. This mandate also made reference to gaining support from a third party or other international institutions for PKOs. In this section of the document, there is a subtle differentiation between Western European institutions facilitating PKOs as entire entities and cooperation with "peacekeeping mechanisms of the CIS."[151] The perspective on the ground looked gruesome and Russia's role either as a restraining force or a party to the conflict remained unclear. 1992 signified an interest in the CSCE to take further institutional steps in securing peace in the CSCE area, as well as signal to a new Russia that the CSCE may have an interest in either providing or supporting security in a traditionally Russian RSC. The mention of the CIS for its tools rather than its institutional integrity may have been a hint at the growing command and control structure disagreement in the PKO debate. Nonetheless, the partial reference to the CIS was an ominous sign for what future CSCE intervention in a Russian RSC might mean for Russian leadership, prestige, and securitization.

The December Ministerial Council in Stockholm to end 1992 reaffirmed the Helsinki II mandate and set the stage for Sweden's chairmanship of the CSCE in 1993. OSCE ministers affirmed their most prominent definition of peacekeeping to date, stating "in association with efforts to bring about political solutions, stability can be enhanced by

---

[150] Allison, Roy (1994): *Peacekeeping in the Soviet Successor* States. Chaillot Papers, No. 18. Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union. 19.

[151] The Challenges of Change. CSCE Helsinki Document 1992. CSCE Summit, 9-10 July 1992. Helsinki, Finland. OSCE Open. OSCE Internet Archive - Document Library (OSCE-DL). https://www.osce.org/mc/39530?download=true. (accessed June 10, 2017). 3-4.

armed contingents for peacekeeping purposes."[152] Conflicts in the Former Yugoslav Republic, Moldova, and Ossetia were all areas of emerging skirmishes, commenting on the potential need for an armed PKO tool.[153] These new mandates also followed the continued offensive of the Azerbaijani Air Force, which bombarded much of Karabakh and solidified their hold on the northern regions that was previously captured under Operation Ring.[154] The need for a military intervention seemed to be more and more apparent as the injection of Russian heavy weapons and the growth of a military caucus in Russian domestic politics further securitized international conflict mediation. The needs of the conflict simultaneously shifted from conflict reconciliation to conflict management.

Stockholm represented the first failure for the CSCE Minsk group to capitalize on the high political will that embodied 1992 and Helsinki II. Though the group had been active and relatively successful in constructing a mediating forum, the unilateral mediation efforts of Russia in discussing a direct PKO agreement between Russia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan marred much of the early momentum. Despite this interest, Russia participated in the Minsk Group prior to 1993. This subsequently blurred who had access to conflict mediation in the former Soviet RSC, what types of intervention could be acceptable and what issues might become securitized. Consequently, the shift from unreserved cooperation in the form of the 1991 Moscow Human Dimension Meeting, to ambiguity about applying such agreements led to a scenario where Russia's intent as a derivative of 'national interest' was pervasive.[155]

December 1992 in Stockholm was the closest any mediation effort had gotten to an agreement in the eyes of Maresca. Both Armenia and Azerbaijan were prepared to agree to a set of conditions leading to peace, but the Azerbaijani delegation pulled out at the last minute. Ambassador Maresca commented that this failure was due to a lack of commitment from the Minsk Group, with the Italian chair missing the meetings due to family commitments and Russia not sending their Minsk Group negotiator due to budgetary constraints.[156] The lack of Russian attendance was read by some as foreshadowing in line

---

[152] Third Meeting of the Council: Summary of Conclusions, Decision on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. Stockholm, Sweden. December 14-15, 1992. Document Number: 3STOCK92.e. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40342. (accessed June 24, 2017). 14-15.
[153] Ibid., 5-6.
[154] De Waal 2013, 209.
[155] Hakala 1998, 9.
[156] Maresca 1996, 480.

with the 'Kozyrev speech' also given at the Stockholm conference. In this speech, the Foreign Minister of Russia Andrei Kozyrev took a hard line on CSCE involvement in the post-Soviet space, warning the international community of what could happen if hard liners took power in Moscow. This was somewhat ironic, because the previous year Kozyrev published articles arguing the need for human rights and integration with the West as a foundation for a new Russia.[157] This further underlines the volatility of political winds, and hence concurrent security strategy in Moscow during the early 1990's.

The Swedes took the failure of NK mediation at Stockholm personally, putting an emphasis on preventative diplomacy in 1993. They also agreed to take over the Minsk Group chairmanship from the Italians in the fall of '93, even though that position was not supposed to be a rotating chair.[158] The supposedly private deal to shift the Minsk Group Chairmanship may have further enhanced the atmosphere of competition in the Minsk Group, trying the patience of others attempting to restrain from unilateralism themselves.[159] Despite the invigorated will from Sweden, the foreshadowing of the 'Kozyrev speech' and growing inclinations for unilateralism were accurate barometers of what 1993 would look like for the CSCE.

1992 was a capstone year for the CSCE as the institution had its highest levels of credibility. It "had not yet been identified with the failures in former Yugoslavia and was not yet understood to be limited by Russian policy to areas outside of the former Soviet Union." With regards to NK, "the parties to the conflict were uncertain of their ability to withstand coherent international pressure."[160] While it may have been a ripe moment for conflict resolution, CSCE rapporteurs to the region understood that any solution would require a security guarantor, hence the beginning of the PKO narrative within the CSCE. While a PKO was a necessary condition agreed on by most parties, the initiative was lacking leadership within the CSCE. Regrettably, most Western states considering it best to just "leave it to the Russians."[161] While smaller states such as Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and Finland took extraordinary responsibility for the resolution of emerging conflicts in the former Soviet Union, they asserted that for the CSCE to wield the legitimacy of consensus, all participating states needed to have an interest in conflict resolution, not just a few.

---

[157] Kozyrev, Andrei V. (1992): Russia and Human Rights. *Slavic Review.* Vol. 51, No. 2. 287
[158] Maresca 1996, 485.
[159] Maresca 2016, 173.
[160] Maresca 1996, 478.
[161] Ibid., 472.

The virtually duel track mediation that existed between the CSCE and Russia was not the only competition that existed. As Armenian and Azerbaijan struggled to negotiate with a singular voice and stabilize their respective strategic cultures, the same questions can be applied to Russia. Within the Russian foreign policy establishment there was competition between the Foreign Ministry and Defense Ministry. The Defense Ministry was the most qualified candidate if one was to look for an organization that knew the land and local power dynamic. The intent to reassert control over their previous domain further manifested itself during 1993 and 1994, continuing from the various 1992 defense initiatives as mentioned previously. For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vladimir Kazimirov allegedly often only heard about parallel military discussions and PKO plans coming from the Russian Defense Ministry through the newspaper, reportedly not being invited to meetings between the US Minsk Group delegation and the Russian Defense Ministry.[162] This lack of internal policy coordination vaguely resembles the contradictory perspectives of Armenian and Azerbaijani political and military leaders from 1992-1993. These competitions for power and influence were possibly a product of the lack of control Moscow wielded over military commanders in the former Soviet space during 1990-1994. Mihalka claims this led to a sense of impudence among the Russian military elite.[163] The historic narrative of Russian mediation regarding a lack of internal subordination influenced how participating states questioned the ability of Moscow to actually control a PKO and hence, Russia as a continuing security provider. This theme was fleshed out as the year continued, culminating with the Budapest Summit and the first Chechnyan war.

The brutal fighting from the December 1993 Azerbaijani offensive continued until the Russian brokered ceasefire of May 1994. Leading up to May, both the Swedish Chair of the Minsk Group Jan Eliasson and the Russian duo of possible PKO commander Georgy Kondratyev and Special Envoy Kazimirov made competing trips to the region in search of peace.[164] Russia finally prevailed in producing a durable ceasefire, but in preparatory meetings regarding post-conflict measures, issues over a PKO were again a stumbling block. Russian Defense Minister Pavel Gerchev required an 1800 troop PKO, but Azerbaijan emphatically differed, giving the CSCE a new opportunity.[165] The ceasefire held

[162] Maresca 1996, 485.
[163] Mihalka 1996, 20.
[164] De Waal 2013, 249.
[165] Mihalka 1996, 19.

and with the threat of further territorial loss for both sides diminished, the competition for rights to mediate, as well as production of the highly valued PKO, continued.

3.6 Realization of Confrontation

The beginning of 1993 marked the shift in Russian policy that was signaled at Stockholm the previous year. Yeltsen announced in February that stopping armed conflicts in the post-Soviet space was a special responsibility of Russia and international organizations should recognize and grant Russia special powers "as guarantor of peace and stability in regions of the former USSR."[166] The verbalization of Russian PKO priorities for the former Soviet space, as well as a tougher stance on what Russia should gain from international institutions became apparent in the Minsk Group. According the Maresca, the Russian Minsk Group delegation worked against most collective initiatives, even when they coincided with what Russia wanted from the peace process. When this new Russian negotiating stance was relayed up Western diplomatic chains of command, it was meet with disbelief and unwillingness to accept such a change in Russian attitudes.[167] The advent of Swedish Foreign Minister af Ugglas as Chairperson-in-Office and the ascension of Sweden as the Chair of the Minsk Group further complicated relations with Russia.[168] Stockholm was interested in pursuing its own shuttle diplomacy with af Ugglas making personal trips to the Transcaucasia region, even though Maresca warned that if the work of the Minsk Group deteriorated due to bilateralism, the US would not be able to balance Russia. Maresca considered that the Russian fear of Western involvement was largely due to the US, who initially proposed the Minsk Group forum. Ironically, the US refused to take any significant responsibility in the mediation process.[169]

This American perception of bilateralism and preference for NATO as a post-Cold-War structure was a clear goal after 1989. The US's position was summed up by President Bush Sr. in a communiqué to the French:

> The North Atlantic Alliance is an essential component of Europe's future. I do not foresee that the CSCE can replace NATO as the guarantor of Western security and

[166] Gelb, Leslie (1993): "Foreign Affairs; Yeltsin as Monroe." *New York Times*. March 7, 1993. http://www.nytimes.com/1993/03/07/opinion/foreign-affairs-yeltsin-as-monroe.html?mcubz=1. (accessed August 18, 2017).
[167] Maresca 1996, 483-84.
[168] Af Ugglas 1994, 17.
[169] Maresca 1996, 486.

> stability. Indeed, it is difficult to visualize how a Europe collective security arrangement including Eastern Europe, and perhaps even the Soviet Union, would have the capability to deter threats to Western Europe…NATO is the only plausible justification in my country for the American military presence in Europe. If NATO is allowed to wither because it has no meaningful political place in the new Europe, the basis for a long-term US military commitment can die with it.[170]

This vision helps historians read why America saw redefining European security with CSCE conflict resolution tools as a threat to American security identity and strategic culture. Like Russia, American strategic culture incorporates the memory of WWII as a legitimizing myth for American power and exceptionalism.

This US disinterest in the CSCE was expressed through active support against institutionalization offered by small states beginning at the 1990 Paris Summit. The US delegation took a markedly different approach in 1990 than at Geneva and Helsinki 1973-75. In an American self-reflection on 73-75, the US allegedly sat back and allowed the Europeans to take the lead.[171] In 1990 however, with more intangibles and the potential shift of American strategic culture due to the perceived loss of a significant other (USSR), the US seemed prepared to maintain strength and disallow the Soviets from finding their way in the back door of a new European security architecture. This materialized in US opposition to a new institutional framework of the CSCE. Proposals the US opposed included: two ministerial meetings a year, new institutions for combating the evolving political crises across the former WP area and Soviet Union, a physical Conflict Prevention Center, and increased openness for greater human movement.[172] The proposal of two ministerial meetings per year was reduced to one and more liberal human movement agreements were denied due to American opposition, even though Basket III issues had been an initial focus of US support for the CSCE process.[173] Most significantly, the US delegation was strongly opposed to the CSCE taking any new role in crisis management. In their view, the CSCE was a forum for arms negotiations and NATO was the only pan-European institution needed for crisis management, even if it would need to extend to the East first.[174] The continued vision that the East and West were opposing actors colored American support for the CSCE and emerging crisis management tools such as a PKO

[170] Sarotte 2010, 245
[171] Maresca 2015, 36
[172] Lehne 1991, 24-30.
[173] Ibid., 26.
[174] Sarotte 2010, 134, 225.

throughout the 1990's, retarding institutional growth. Looking from the opposite side, this opposition solidified support of small states to the CSCE, as institutional evolution and conflict management continued to develop despite this opposition.

As the conflict of mediation continued to percolate on the European wide level, the results of 1993 in local, South Caucasian politics begged the question of if either Armenia or Azerbaijan were able to function cohesively and therefore, able to negotiate with a singular voice. As the rhetoric of Armenian and Azerbaijani officials showed in 1992 and early 1993, there was a preconception that the region needed a security provider. The interest each side had for Russia to fulfill that role dependent on who was in charge of local politics at any particular moment. This was contrasted in 1993 by two statements from af Ugglas about Sweden's work throughout 1993 to ignite CSCE mediation:

> I said many times during my visits to the Transcaucasian CSCE states last year that the CSCE cannot solve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem for the parties
> …
> In my view, there has been a propensity to ascribe the lack of progress in conflict resolution to technical factors like the low level of the mediation efforts or insufficient competence or vision on the part of the local CSCE presence in the conflict area, when the real problem has been the absence of unequivocal political support from member states.[175]

This commentary reveals two insights. The first being that while the CSCE undertook efforts to mediate the NK conflict, they only became familiar with the full weight of the historic security structures they were inserting themselves into over time. The perceptions of actors such as Sweden and their posture towards Russia clearly progressed from not knowing how to deal with Russia at Paris in 1990, to implicitly recognizing them as one of the primary inflammatory actors in the region. Af Ugglas' account presents the perception that the CSCE's vision was not to fill the void Russia had left, but rather to create space, by restraining Russia, so that the principle of sovereign equality would allow Armenia and Azerbaijan to take more responsibility in their own security. Af Ugglas, in her second comment, clearly alludes to the inability of the CSCE to win over Russia (and the US) in regards to implementing the principles of the Final Act in NK mediation. That being said, the focus of Armenian and Azerbaijani elites in their 1992-1993 statements showed interest in finding an alternative security structure as a determinate of great powers. This could be accomplished either through Russia, Turkey, Iran, or NATO, rather than taking personal

[175] Af Ugglas 1994, 12, 16.

responsibility for a RSC. There was a fundamental difference of opinion in how regional security should be produced. Therefore, when De Wall commented on Armenia and Azerbaijan not being ready for peace as late as 2013, it can be interpreted as the parties not being ready for the type of regional security the CSCE/OSCE was attempting to open up due to deeper memory politics and hence, foundations of strategic culture.

Af Ugglas as CiO understood the ability of the CSCE as a young institution was dependent on the political will of participating states. She also understood the growing conflict between the organization and Russia over mediation, citing the need for CSCE pressure via participating states' senior officials to persuade Russia to withdraw troops from Estonia and other NIS engagements. The conflict in Moldova was a similar confrontation in which the CSCE engaged, but lacked support from senior officials, thereby allowing Russia unilateral mediation rights under the banner of CSCE involvement.[176] Mihalka commented on how Russia continued to use this strategy of legitimizing themselves as the new RSC center of a post-Soviet RSC through international organizations so as to regain lost prestige. When this strategy was not successful in obtaining command and control and Russian PKO leadership in NK, Russian diplomats spoke out directly against the impotency of the CSCE Minsk group prior to the Budapest Summit in 1994.[177] While larger participating states such as the US refused to take a strong position on Russian mediation in NK and were negligent about any CSCE initiatives in the region, the unilateral diplomacy undertaken by the Swedish and Czechoslovakian CiOs may have been the only reason mediation remained within a CSCE framework.

3.7 International Perspectives and Third Party PKOs

From an external perspective, the UN resolutions of 1993 vaguely called attention to the conflict of mediation taking place within the CSCE. Four resolutions reassert the UN endorsement of the CSCE mediation process, but also highlighting the ability of the Russian Federation to produce a ceasefire.[178] The juxtaposition of the Russian Federation as an independent actor outside of the Minsk Group, but 'in support of' reaffirms the discourse of Russia as the primary security provider. There were also consistent calls by the

[176] Af Ugglas 1994, 17, 25.
[177] Mihalka 1996, 19.
[178] United Nations Security Council Resolution 874. October 14, 1993. Document Number: S/RES/874. UN-ODS https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/557/41/PDF/N9355741.pdf?OpenElement. (accessed June 14, 2017).

UN for the CSCE to convene the Minsk Conference as soon as possible and produce further monitoring missions to the region. The ability of Russia to achieve limited positive results, while the CSCE was only able to produce a limited fact finding mission of experts from October 6-14, 1993, may have also influenced the UN and the perspectives of the wider international community.[179] While these were the only UN resolutions during the conflict, their symbolism gives insight to the mediation debate and perceptions of legitimacy. It also gives an outside perspective on the mediation narrative, confirming the assertion offered here that conflict over mediation was a relevant trope even to observers of the time.

Russian peacekeeping as an impartial force lost much of its international credibility in the early 1990's due to the conflicts in Georgia and Moldova. As a result, Ettore Greco comments that Russia began looking toward other international organizations for a renewed mandate of force and legitimacy.[180] Giamluca Burci in 1997 offers the observation that Russia used "one organization against the other [CSCE and UN] so as to weaken them both and strengthen its own freedom of movement." He continues by saying that "Russian policy in the OSCE and the UN has been adamantly in favor of preserving a sphere of influence for the Russian Federation as the sole effective guarantor of security in the former Soviet area."[181] Zagorski confirms these interpretations in a later account, adding that the goal of Russian multilateral diplomacy was to work against the changing status quo in the post-Soviet space.[182] Manifesting through the UN's legitimization of Russian unilateral mediation in reference to CSCE principles throughout '93, these efforts intensified following the CSCE Rome mandate for third party peacekeeping at the end of the year.

As 1993 dragged on, it became more and more apparent that "without Russian support any peacekeeping operation in the Caucasus would have a difficult time; but with Russian participation such an operation could have a good chance of success."[183] CSCE

---

[179] Annual Report 1993 on CSCE Activities, CSCE Secretary General. OSCE Open. Section 2.9.

[180] Greco, Ettore (1997): Third Party Peace-keeping and the Interaction between Russia and the OSCE in the CIS Area. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 271.

[181] Burci, Gianluca (1997): Division of Labour between the UN and the OSCE in Connection with Peace-keeping. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 300-301.

[182] Zagorski, Andrei (2009): Multilateralism in Russian Foreign Policy Approaches. In: Torjesen, Stina and Rowe, Elana Wilson (ed.) *The Multilateral Dimension in Russian Foreign Policy.* Routledge 2009. 54.

[183] Maresca 1996, 483-84.

participating states clearly had support for a general, philosophical PKO mandate, but the ability to finance and field a multinational PKO, much less construct the institutional structures needed to manage a PKO became a primary area of concern. Along with Yeltsin's rhetoric demanding the international community recognize Russia's unique role in the former Soviet space to start the year, the idea of a CIS PKO in Nagorno-Karabakh began to be floated. This created discontinuity in the Minsk Group because Russia wanted an international mandate for the use of force to further legitimize their military presence.[184] The CSCE was defiantly against this because the Helsinki II mandate disallowed the use of force and represented a fundamental debate over whether the CSCE would renege on previous mandates and what precedent that would set for future CSCE norms. This debate personified the deadlock and competition in the Minsk Group during 1993, culminating with the Azeri winter offensive and the CSCE Rome Ministerial Council.

As the fear of direct Russian military intervention and lack of cooperation in CSCE mediation increased, the 1993 Rome Ministerial tasked the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) with further investigating the possibility of CSCE third party PKO and their ability to fall in line with FA norms. The debate initiated at the Helsinki Summit in '92 and modified at Rome '93, furthered Russian interest in riding the political will for a CSCE PKO and channeling it into funding for a CIS PKO. The general idea was that a third party institution, such as the CIS, could create the framework for a multinational PKO the CSCE had yet to develop, accommodating much of the structural stability needed. [185] Rome was an attempt to bridge the divide between the CSCE and Russia in regards to PKO practices. Russia appeared to have two priorities: 1) having a majority Russian assemblage in any PKO in NK and thus a majority say in the command and control structure 2) an international mandate for the use of force. Numerous CSCE participating states on the other hand envisioned a multinational PKO with Russia as the minority troop provider and no mandate for the use of force. Azerbaijan was a crucial voice, as they never acquiesced to a force with Russian troops, continuing to cause tension in the Minsk Group. Participating states agreeing to the middle ground of discussing a CIS PKO under the auspices of the CSCE, nuancing the discussion of who was to provide security in the post-Soviet space.

---

[184] Allison 1994, 37.

[185] CSCE and the New Europe – Our Security is Indivisible: Decisions of the Rome Council Meeting. Rome, Italy, November 30- December 1, 1993. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40401. (accessed June 23, 2018).

After various political factions in Russia trumpeted rhetoric regarding their inherent right to a sphere of influence throughout 1993, regional states and former union republics strictly opposed such CIS peacekeeping because of the precedent it might set. The Baltic States, Ukraine, Turkey, and Azerbaijan continually voiced their inability to acquiesce to a joint CSCE/CIS PKO in NK, forcing Russia to abandon the idea within the CSCE during the course of 1994.[186] The CSCE would have been agreeing to pay in some estimates four times the annual budget, for a CIS operation, which had previously been defined by majority Russian troops. Russia also refused to yield to CSCE participating states interest in having the CSCE administer the chain of command if they provided funding.[187] A new point of incompatibility was reached and the Russian position on a third Party PKO morphed into the interest of obtaining a PKO with a use of force mandate, as well as a more favorable chain-of-command for Russian oversight. These points of contention reemerged in the FSC PKO review during OSCE institutional consolidation from 1997-2003 (chapter three).

The third party peacekeeping option was partially considered due to the CSCE's increasing involvement with the growing conflict in former Yugoslavia in cooperation with the UN and NATO. It was seen as a way of further streamlining the CSCE as a conflict management facilitator. Similar to the crisis of purpose that emanated from the quick solution to the German issue in 1990 and the uncertainty of how to deal with a new Russia, the CSCE was still searching for its place in a new European security architecture. The third party PKO debate, while short lived, was an attempt to see what would stick with regards to political will and new conflict management strategies. This was coupled with the perception that a "successful operations in Nagorno-Karabakh and Chechnya would [also] enhance the authority of the CSCE as a lead institution in situations involving the region of the Commonwealth of Independent States."[188] Though third party PKO discussions never solidified into a structure for bridging the growing EU and shifting CIS RSC, the rhetoric sustained legitimacy as an official CSCE proposal, utilized throughout the PKO debate.

---

[186] Greco 1997, 272.

[187] Ibid., 275

[188] Möttölä, Kari (1997): The OSCE: Institutional and Functional Developments in an Evolving European Security Order. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 8.

3.8 The Spark of a Summit

The culmination of these four years of political will and what can be defined as a democratic euphoria following the end of the Cold War climaxed in Budapest 1994. The conference moved to make itself an organization, seeing a special place in the new post-Cold War order as a self-proclaimed bridge between those who wanted to consolidate democracy and those who wanted to begin building it. The CSCE accomplished this by recognizing the various lenses of security necessary in safeguarding a European, democratic vision.[189] Analysts of the time, Michael Bothe, Natalino Ronzitti, and Allan Rosas, commented that "the participating states have given the OSCE the historic assignment of stabilizing Europe."[190] The ability to begin such a mission was significant because it was an inclusive project that continued to create a new collective security consciousness, sustaining the continuity between a traditionally Russian RSC and an emerging European supercomplex that they had begun in 1975. That being said, as Budapest approached, "it became clear that the ability of the CSCE to field a genuinely internationally controlled peacekeeping force for the Karabakh conflict would be a key test for the success of the summit leaders in giving the CSCE a meaningful post-Cold war conflict resolution role."[191] It would also be further recognition of the narrative clash between 'back to Europe' and 'common European home'.

Prior to the Budapest Summit, President Clinton and President Yeltsen both agreed to attend. Weeks before the summit, there was controversy over Clinton's near decision to skip the meetings because the White House had planned a reception for the same day, showing the low priority level the CSCE still held in the view of American policymakers. Once Clinton did arrive, he used the opportunity to call on the CSCE to take up more conflict mediation roles, but only insomuch as NATO was the foundation for European security. This led to President Yeltsen cautioning the West, in line with his January 1993 remarks, that "Europe, not yet having freed itself from the heritage of the Cold War, is in danger of plunging into a cold peace."[192]

---

[189] Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. OSCE Open. Budapest, Hungary. December 5-6, 1994. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL https://www.osce.org/mc/39554. (accessed July 5, 2017). 1-5.

[190] Bothe; Ronzitti; Rosas (ed.) 1997, 511.

[191] Maresca 1996, 491.

[192] Santos, Lori (1994): "Clinton attends CSCE Summit." *United Press International*. December 5, 1994. http://www.upi.com/Archives/1994/12/05/Clinton-attends-CSCE-summit/7869786603600/. (accessed August 7, 2017).

The Russian interest in heads-of-states', summit level agreements and the international prestige that went along with them had been apparent since the 1975 Helsinki and 1986 Stockholm days. The Russian leadership put a large emphasis on the CSCE Budapest summit, hoping to progress some of their regional security interest through an internationally legitimate forum. With the continued lack of interest from the United States, the crucial legitimizer in the eyes of the Kremlin, there began to be reports of Russia slowing its mediation concessions. Though the Budapest document gave a clear mandate for CSCE mediation in Karabakh, the two major issues of command and control structures and the number of Russian troops in a CSCE PKO were left untouched. In the view of Maresca, as in 1975, Russia wanted the legitimacy of the CSCE. They most likely would have conceded on previously held positions of command and control and troop composition if other substantial actors such as the US had offered high level support for the CSCE process.[193] As it was Kissinger who obtained Soviet acceptance of far reaching Basket III concessions in 1975, and President Bush, Secretary of State James Baker, and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl who obtained Gorbachev's consent for German reunification in 1990, Clinton was in a similar position to entice Russia and situate the CSCE process for success in the NIS. Because high-level commitment was not there from the US, two outcomes occurred. The first being small states were forced to take an even larger role in sustaining CSCE prominence in negotiating the NK conflict as political will and euphoria deteriorated in the second half of the 1990's. Secondly, Russia continued to raise the issue of command and control as a way of sustaining an impact on both the CSCE and their sphere of influence.

With all the hype leading up to the talks, Budapest successfully became the summit where the NK conflict received a comprehensive mandate for mediation and conflict management.[194] Russia was appointed Minsk Group co-chair along with Sweden, validating Russia's privileged mediation position, albeit within the CSCE mediation process. Sweden was replaced by Finland as co-chair in April 1995, falling in line with parts of the Finnish narrative that promotes institutionalization of the CSCE.[195] The competition over mediation reached a climax and the political will reflected in the final document from Budapest,

[193] Maresca 1996, 489.
[194] Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. OSCE Open.14.
[195] Möttölä 2017, 17.

which significantly referred to the Russian Federation by name,[196] represented a momentary resolution to the question of how to deal with Russia in the NIS. The significance of a reference to one participating state is very interesting, as the political will to acknowledge one member state is a symbol of the high political will of the period. It is also a historical pointer to a larger narrative of CSCE courtship of the Russian Federation. Budapest marked fleeting success resulting from the numerous attempts to coopt Russia into CSCE conflict mediation structures based on the new interpretations of the Helsinki Decalogue.

The third party PKO mandate of Rome was also being replaced by the consensus affirmation that a multinational PKO would be an essential element of any political resolution in NK. Participating states negated Russian attempts to resolve the NK conflict with third party CIS peacekeeping forces, rather mandating a multinational OSCE peacekeeping force.[197] The ability for the CSCE to gain Russian consensus on this measure was pivotal, as it marked a new direction in cooperation. The stalemate that plagued the Minsk Group of 1993 seemed to be softening.

While the issue of competitive mediation seemed to be temporarily averted through a summit level consensus document, the low-level deadlock within the Minsk Group continued post-Budapest. For Maresca the ability of the CSCE to achieve consensus at a ministerial and head of state level, but not in subsequent working groups, highlighted how the Minsk Group was used to impede various CSCE participating state's interests. In the opinion of Maresca:

> The Russian problem grew to be so dominant in the mediation process that the Russians were later made co-chairmen of the Minsk Group itself. This was seen by the Minsk Group participants as the only possible way to gain genuine Russian cooperation. The irony has been that even as co-chairman the Russians have continued to undercut the work of the Minsk Group.[198]

Though CSCE member states made concessions as the heads of state level at Budapest and eventually within the Minsk Group, the substantial issues necessary for peace were not addressed. While Russian co-option into the CSCE/OSCE mediation format seemed as it had been a concession by the Russians, in reality, according to Mihalka, it was what Russia

---

[196] Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. OSCE Open. 14-15.
[197] Halonen, Tarja (1997): *Finland as a Mediator in the Karabakh Conflict.* The Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Publications of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki, Finland. 7.
[198] Maresca 1996, 498.

needed to re-attain status as a legitimate RSC.[199] Some Western actors went as far as to question if Russia was genuine in their efforts to cooperate with outside parties due to issues that remained intractable such as command and control. This matter continued to be a primary issue of focus post Budapest and was a key issue in shaping how the OSCE institutions consolidated post 1994.

The final Budapest document not only created a mandate for a potential OSCE multinational PKO, it also created additional structures to support such action. The High Level Planning Group (HLPG), the successor and institutional consolidation of the IOPG, was mentioned as a new organ to be constructed and staffed.[200] The HLPG became the functional arm of any OSCE PKO, responsible for force projection, supply chain logistic, commanded structure, and so on. But as will come to be seen in the HLPG narrative, the rotating one year terms and subsequent lack of institutional knowledge on the part of most HLPG heads led to a need of further interconnectedness and eventual subordination to the CPC. The HLPG also became a point of debate for Russia due to their preoccupation with OSCE PKO command and control, which was directly influenced by the HLPG.

The Budapest Summit also made landmark changes in regards to the power of the Chairman-in-office (CiO). The position was collectively agreed to be strengthened, with specific responsibilities in convincing further economic forums and institutions, dispatching personal representatives for regional conflicts, overseeing the planning of the new multinational PKO mandate, monitoring and informing OSCE member states of non-implementation of human rights commitments, as well as working as a liaison with non-member Mediterranean states.[201] The Hungarian Ambassador to the CSCE/OSCE from 1990-1996, István Gyarmati, portrayed the Charter of Paris as a semblance of European optimism, which was reaffirmed with the decisions of the Budapest Summit. [202] The significance of the Budapest mandates came to play a significant role in the position small states took in the OSCE. Nünlist asserts that from 1995-2015, 75 percent of chairmanships were held by small states (defined as states with populations from 1-15 million inhabitants).[203] While some states turned away from the CSCE due to disillusionment

[199] Mihalka 1996, 14.
[200] Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. OSCE Open. 15.
[201] Ibid., 3,4,6,28,42,44.
[202] Gyarmati, Istvan (1996): The Hungarian Chairmanship and the Chechnya Conflict. *OSCE Yearbook*. Vol. 1. 176.
[203] Nünlist 2015, 49.

during the 1990-1994 period, the Budapest Summit and the subsequent Hungarian OSCE Chairmanship worked to reaffirm the hope of the early 1990's. In line with the Czech and Swedish CiOs, Hungary strengthened the norm of small state leadership.

3.9 Chechnya and the Road from Paris

The Hungarian Chairmanship was a significant part of a larger argumentation in support of small states ownership of the CSCE/OSCE through institutionalization. Hungary's addition to this discourse was their initial guidance and implementation of OSCE involvement in the First Russian-Chechnya War. Within two weeks of the beginning of negotiations, Special Representative to the Chechnyan conflict, Hungarian Ambassador Istvan Gyarmati, commented that Russia accepted the need for an international organization to participate in internal conflict resolution. This is significant, because the fact that some factions still adhered to Gorbachev's compromises negating 'non-interference in internal affairs' was surprising even for the Hungarians. Moscow officials, initially suspicious of foreign involvement, gradually became more cooperative after they themselves saw the horrors of the war. During 1995, the Russian presidential administration was deeply uninformed about the ongoing war because the defense and security services were sanitizing and withholding information. Yeltsin was making political decisions, which were promptly being ignored by politicians and military officials overseeing the conflict. Eventually, with the realization of atrocity and inability to enforce a domestic power vertical, the OSCE was given a mandate to create political peace.[204] This marked one of the first times the OSCE was allowed such a unilateral mediation and resolution role, in Russia nonetheless. This juxtaposition of the conflict of mediation over NK and the relatively quick assertion of institutional mediation in Chechnya showed how far the institution had come since 1990 as a cooperative international body able to raise political will when needed. Hungary was able to effectively direct this newfound institutional impulse. Though the mediation of Chechnya was unsuccessful and had larger implications for relations between Russia and the OSCE, the opportunity marked an institutional high point.

The ideas associated with strategic culture for Hungary can be seen as a microcosm for the evolution of a new European idea of security. Hungary, like many other former Warsaw Pact countries, entered a period of internal debate and thus, shifting strategic

[204] Gyarmati 1996, 180.

culture and priorities in the early 1990's. While Hungary had a clear commitment to Euro-Atlantic values, the question of how to best achieve those goals was unclear in the immediate transition period. Conflict management became a key issue for defining sovereign, foreign, and defense policy during Hungary's security identity crisis from 1990-1995. According to Peter Tala and Tamas Csiki, the questions of how to produce conflict management for Hungary was (and is) inherently associated with "small state syndrome," requiring participation in a larger international organization to achieve these goals. The Hungarian OSCE Chairmanship was paralleled by continued violence in the Bosnian War as well as the increased role NATO took in the Balkan crisis in 1994. Though Hungary took increased leadership in the OSCE in relation to Chechnya during 1995, they subsequently produced their first major foreign deployment (military engineers) to Bosnia-Herzegovina. This took place within the framework of the NATO Implementation Force (IFOR) in 1996, continuing in the NATO Stabilization Force (SFOR) after 1997, working as a springboard for participation in future EU and NATO conflict management missions.[205]

Looking back at the history of Hungry in the CSCE process, there are clues that help read the developing strategic culture and Hungarian OSCE Chairmanship. In the early years following 1975, Hungarian General Secretary Janos Kadar became "the West's 'favorite communist'" as Hungary became a leading implementer of Basket III in the East.[206] Kadar understood that the CSCE could be a mechanism to diminish the impact of the Brezhnev Doctrine and move away from colonial security (Soviet/Warsaw Pact Super Complex RSC) toward a form of security closer to domestic ideals. Hungary looked for economic independence and growth similar to the Finnish model for successful neutrality. A way to bring the "West closer to the socialist countries," while successfully navigating the Brezhnev doctrine.[207] In seeing the image of Finland as a model for Hungary during the Cold War years, such similes may have influenced Hungarian support for OSCE conflict management and the self-narrative of leadership in the CSCE. The dedication of the two countries to OSCE conflict management in the early 1990's reflects longer traditions of commonalities in regards to how domestic security goals could be achieved through the CSCE/OSCE. That being said, Hungary's shifting strategic culture debates in the early

[205] Tala, Peter and Csiki, Tamas (2010): Hungary. In: *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Biehl, Heiko, Bastian Giegerich, Alexandra Jonas ed. 165-169.
[206] Miklóssy 2010, 152.
[207] Ibid., 146.

1990's seemed to be colored with a different memory of the communism past compared to Finland. This may have influenced the narrative each actor subsequently envisioned for their personal idea of a secure Europe. Finland achieved security over the past half century through diplomatic and economic means, including a multifaceted security identity through the CSCE process, while Hungary only achieved minimal area for movement while being part of the Soviet bloc. Thus, newfound sovereignty and the continued struggle in addressing the communist past may have pushed Hungary towards NATO as a provider of European security after their failed attempts at producing successful conflict management structures in Chechnya. Nonetheless, the experience of Chechnya and the precedent Hungary set for a new, empowered OSCE chairperson was part of the narrative of OSCE evolution as a container for a specific discourse of European security.

The Budapest Summit was seen by some observers of the time as an end to the conflict in mediation that defined the CSCE's involvement in the Karabakh conflict from 1990-1994.[208] Russia was technically incorporated into the CSCE mediation process for NK, which was seen as one of the OSCE's first perceived successes as an organization able to impact Russian involvement in the Former Soviet union (FSU). Initial access to Chechnya was also a sign of the spark offered at Budapest. On the other hand, the war in Bosnia continued with NATO taking a more active role in conflict management. Many new OSCE member states turned their attention to the existing structures of European security due to the limited results the OSCE could produce on short notice. The early period of the 1990's was defined by uncertainty in what a new Europe would be, as well as the ideas of what newly independent states wanted Europe to become. With domestic and international ideas of these conceptions in flux, the CSCE continued to institutionalize. This is a testament to the fact that there is an aspect of Europe that requires cooperation with Russia. Regardless of the debate between memorialization and repression of the communist period for members of the former WP and Russia, the alternative was also present. A memory of the CSCE process as a driver of cooperation influenced small states perceptions of what type of security the forum could provide. It was also a constant reminder that Russia has an inherent definition of Europe incorporated into its identity and memory politics.

[208] Bothe; Ronzitti; Rosas (ed.) 1997, 511.

4 Sustaining Hope – Institutional Evolution

"The OSCE has been a kind of laboratory for conflict management, progressing by means of trial and error."

Michael Bothe, Natalino Ronzitti, and Allan Rosas 1996 [209]

The narrative of competition over mediation rights in the early 1990's possessed a larger historic significance in the overall CSCE/OSCE evolution. The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Hungary, among others, continued to push back against perceived revision of the new Helsinki Decalogue by reasserting previously agreed upon norms. The period after 1995 exhibited greater cooperation by some former WP states with NATO as a conflict management body. That being said, the majority of small states still remembered the image the CSCE offered throughout history, supporting institutionalization even if in a passive form. The PKO narrative post-1995 is a primary example of how small states with an experience of success in the CSCE process had the ability to progress the vision of security agreed upon at Paris in 1990. The aptitude to sustain previously established norms allowed small states to prepare for new liminal moment in history in which to spark collective political will similar to Helsinki 1975, Stockholm 1985, Paris 1990, and Budapest 1994.

The initial construction of this claim was seen in the previous chapter with the advent of small states as CSCE CiOs and their subsequent conflict management leadership. The second part of this claim is associated with the institutional evolution of the CSCE/OSCE. Many of the organization's forums and structures where shaped by the NK conflict as well as the questions of conflict resolution surrounding it. At the same time, the CSCE/OSCE failed on many occasions to mobilize political will due to a lack of institutional foundation and proven conflict management strategies. This crisis of functionality was apparent with the conflict of mediation over NK.

The process of CSCE/OSCE growth in the 1990's, as mentioned before, was part of the debate over whether to implement new or existing post-Cold War structures.[210] As various actors attempted to pursue OSCE institutionalization in the face of an apprehensive consensus around NATO, the pains of constructing new mediation and conflict

[209] Bothe; Ronzitti; Rosas (ed.) 1997, 511.
[210] Sarotte 2010, 98, 101, 125, 172, 174-175, 184, 192, 194.

management structures, as well as satisfying all member states became apparent. In the words of Milanova:

> The years-long negotiation efforts on Nagorno-Karabakh expose the arbitrariness and selectivity in the support to one or the other principle at various stages of the conflict. The attempts to deal with operational matters rather than addressing the major concerns behind the conflict raised the parties' fear that their vital interests are discarded and largely contributed to their alienation from the OSCE peace activities. In the absence of enforcement power, the success of any OSCE initiatives is contingent primarily on the goodwill of the parties. Such goodwill will be possible on two conditions — precise and well-formulated principles for addressing their major concerns and their consistent application.[211]

Though it is easy to say that operational matters took priority, the answer to why this was and the underlying principles of the actual aim of furthering operational matters is a more extensive discussion. There is also the counter point to be made, that operational matters were not necessarily negative, as is connoted in Milanova's account. The CSCE/OSCE would not have had the ability to effectively plan a multinational PKO, implement new missions, or gain access to Chechnya if the organization had not simultaneously focused on operational matters, or institutional evolution. Thus, the question is not what the CSCE/OSCE should have focused on, but rather why it was not ready to facilitate peace and all the responsibilities that went along with that in the 1990's. This claim will be displayed through the historic evolution of the Conflict Prevention Center (CPC), High Level Planning Group (HLPG), and Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) from 1990-2004.

Other authors and current practitioners such as Ruben Harutunian have echoed this perspective, asking the OSCE to address more of the major concerns associated with the conflict.[212] Again, this is a relatively common claim in the literature, but shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the OSCE and its historical purpose as a facilitator and forum for cooperation. The CSCE/OSCE process of the 1990's was an attempt to find a middle ground between a purely political dialog and a functional conflict management organization. While participating states had a say in both processes, the institutions that began to evolve also had a growing influence in these debates, nuancing state interests.

---

[211] Milanova 2002, 293-294.

[212] Hartutunian, Ruben (2010): The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict: Moving from Power Brokerage to Relationship Restructuring. *International Negotiation: A Journal of Theory and Practice*. Vol 5. No1. 57-80.

Actor's narratives are critical in contemplating what member states wanted out of this process and what responsibility the institution was actually able to take on.

4.1 HLPG Directives – High Level Planning Group

The HLPG story is a specific subset of the OSCE PKO mandate that illustrates the significance of institutionalization for sustaining norms during periods of low political will, while waiting for new historic moments of opportunity in the negotiation process. Over the years, consideration of a multilateral OSCE security solution caused various degrees of discontent for Russia due to shifting strategic culture and domestic politics. As a subset of the larger politico-military debate, the independent responsibility the HLPG obtained reflected on the larger process of OSCE evolution. The growing possibility of the OSCE taking on an identity as a traditional security provider can be viewed as having an impact on Russia's attitude toward the organization as a potential threat of securitization and overlay in a post-Soviet RSC.

The account of HLPG directives goes hand in hand with the various narratives small states attempted to write in the OSCE. The HLPG Directives, or requests from the CiO on how the HLPG should direct their work under the respective chairmanship, attest to the modest amount of autonomous institutional power the CiO had over small, structural elements of conflict resolution and institutional evolution. Within this discussion there are ten directives during the period of analysis, issued from a variety of CiOs. Directives One and Three were not in the archives and therefore are exempt from this analysis. While the HLPG directives are a major analytical layer to be considered, questions of funding were also a major issue that caused the PKO process to stagnate multiple times and will be considered as part of the HLPG discussion.

Early Euphoria and New Precedents

The HLPG began work on the issue of planning an OSCE PKO shortly after its mandate was created in Budapest 1994. Taking over for the IOPG, the new HLPG began its seminal mandate of constructing options for a multinational PKO.[213] The plans took a year to devise and present options to participating states, and represented an informal method of administering monitoring missions. The first chair of the HLPG, Finnish General Vilén,

[213] Vilén, Karie 1995, 107.

made trips to the NK region in September 1995 in preparation for a potential deployment. He was also able to report on the actual conditions of conflict in the region.[214] This responsibility gained greater significance over time because visits to the region stopped from 1997-2005, even though a majority of participating states were in favor of continued HLPG monitoring missions,

By the 1995 Ministerial Meeting in Budapest, the HLPG had completed initial options for a multinational PKO. Options included:

> — Type A. Traditional armed peacekeeping operations of the "blue-helmet" type;
> — Type B. Unarmed observer/monitoring peacekeeping operations;
> — Type C. Combinations of Type A and B; and
> — Type D. Peacekeeping operations with other international organizations, including turnkey operations. [215]

On average, any of these missions were expected to utilize 3000 personnel, with an expense of $100 million for the first six months.[216] The CiO would direct any PKO operation, with limited formal structures for direct control from participating states in the actual management of the PKO after implementation. These issues of command and control, as well as use of force, were primary issues of contention for Russia if the OSCE was to produce a PKO in Russia's perceived RSC. HLPG visits of international military personnel to the region, similar to the Czechoslovak mission in 1992, may have become a securitized issue for Russia under these emerging conditions. The issue of command and control may have been exacerbated in 1995 as well when the HLPG recommended no Russian officers in the first military staff proposal for any potential OSCE PKO command and control structure. [217] Accordingly, small state support for the HLPG via non-consensus based directives will be understood within the possibly securitized context of mediation competition and disagreements over command and control.

Directives from 1995 to 1996 reflect on the initial period of high political will. There was hope that the 1994 HLPG mandate would set the foundation of OSCE mediation

---

[214] Report by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the Conflict dealt with by the Minsk Conference in distributed at the request of the Chairman-in-Office. November 9, 1995. Document Number: REF.SEC/334/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[215] High Level Planning Group: Mission Statement for a Possible Peacekeeping Mission to the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. June 27, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/23/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[216] Ibid.

[217] HLPG Staff List. September 20, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/72/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

and solidify an OSCE mandated political solution and subsequent multinational PKO. Directive Two, issued by the Hungarian chairmanship in 1995 focused on refining the functional aspects of the HLPG, such as clarifying the mission, chain of command, logistical support, contingency planning, and phased deployments. Most significantly, the wording of the document asserted that planning for an OSCE PKO presented a unique opportunity to create a leaner and more cost effective peacekeeping structure. This implied that the impact of an OSCE PKO was not only for keeping peace in Nagorno-Karabakh, but for modernizing the peacekeeping field internationally.[218] This directive also allowed Hungary to unilaterally address issues that were not agreed upon in the summit environment. Hungary effectively used the power of a newly reinforced chairmanship position to strengthening the norm of an OSCE command and control structure, even though consensus negotiations only created a vague mandate on the issue. While there is no access to Directive Number One or Three, it is almost certain that Directive One was issued by the Hungarian CiO, as they were the first CiO to oversee the HLPG. As for Directive Three, it is highly likely that it was issued during the Hungarian tenure because Directive Four was issued by the subsequent CiO in the first two months of their chairmanship. With the new minimalist tools for institutionalization offered by HLPG directives, OSCE participating states positioned themselves for a political solution in NK. In the opinion of Vilén, such actions were critical in building confidence for Armenian and Azerbaijan, showing that the OSCE could act when needed.[219]

The fourth directive was not as significant as the Hungarian issuance. Disseminated in 1996 by the Swiss chairmanship, it sustained the process and reiterated the significance of OSCE organs. Directive Four most pointedly asserted that any political agreement should be dependent on the recommendations of the HLPG and said recommendations should be the basis for OSCE decision making bodies as they move forward with a PKO in Nagorno-Karabakh.[220] The second point is significant because it shifts the responsibility and likelihood of success in a mediated peace to all member states of the OSCE as they would now need to be involved in a multinational PKO. It also attempts to conceptually place the HLPG within the context of a larger OSCE institutionalization process, making

[218] Hungary Chairman-in-Office: High Level Planning Group, Chairman-in-Office Directive No. 2. June 20, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/19/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.
[219] Vilén 1997, 111.
[220] Switzerland Chairman-in-Office: High Level Planning Group, Chairman-in-Office Directive Number 4. February 23, 1996. Document Number: REF.CIO/15/96. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

the HLPG interdependent on other OSCE conflict management organs, much like the evolution of the CPC will show.

The presentation of Directive Four by the Swiss is also important when looking at the larger position they took in the CSCE/OSCE process regarding the democratization of conflict management. Similar to the Valleta mechanism (see CPC section) that the Swiss pursued over a three decade span, the facilitation of a multination OSCE PKO function held similar aims. While the OSCE did not have the collective political will to continually push Russia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan towards a settlement and a potential shift in how security was perceived in the region, they did have the ability to continue evolving OSCE structures to indirectly influence the mediation process.

Swiss strategic culture, similar to Finland, Austria, and other N+N states, continues to have a deep commitment to international institutions seen through the CSCE process. Their burdening of responsibility for hosting substantial meetings for the initial CSCE from 1973-1975 were more labor intensive than the short, half-month conference Finland hosted for the heads of states' signing ceremony. Switzerland, like Finland, has maintained its support for the OSCE regardless of the shifting winds of NATO, leading some to propose that Switzerland be the permanent chair of the OSCE.[221] While neither a member of the EU or NATO, it seemed that the narrative Switzerland wrote in the CSCE/OSCE process was more insulated from the prospect of a better alliance. That being said, Christian Nünlist and Benno Zogg argue that Switzerland is "deeply anchored in the Western camp," rarely taking sides or assigning blame, "not least in order to keep open its option to mediate between parties to the conflict."[222] In this vain, the Swiss 1996 chairmanship in a period of deteriorating political will stressed the need for an "enhancement of the OSCE's operational capabilities" so as to cement a realistic security model.[223] Swiss leadership was also significant in facilitating the 1996 Lisbon Summit that unlike the Paris Summit in 1990, proclaimed a "Common and Comprehensive Security Model for Europe for the

---

[221] Liechtenstein, Stephanie (2014): A Permanent Swiss Chairmanship for the OSCE – a Viable Suggestion? *Security and Human Rights Monitor*. July 28, 2014. https://www.shrmonitor.org/permanent-swiss-chairmanship-osce-viable-suggestion/. (accessed March 3, 2018).

[222] Nünlist, Christian and Zogg, Benno (2017): Swiss Narratives in the Evolution of European Security 1990-2016. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 119

[223] Switzerland Chairman-in-Office: The Security Model Discussion 1995-1996: Report of the chairman-in-Office to the Lisbon Summit. November 30, 1996. Lisbon, Portugal. Document Number: LS96EW02. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40928. (accessed May 25, 2017). 1.

twenty-first century" and the beginning of new negotiations on a Treaty on Common Forces in Europe (CFE).[224] Conversely, with the 1999 crisis of cooperation seen at Istanbul, partially emanating from NATO action in Kosovo, the Swiss turned back toward their role of credible impartiality, building up bilateral ties with Russia.[225] Despite the shifting foreign policy narratives, Switzerland played a leading role in the institutional and PKO debates after 1995, when liminal support from numerous new participating states drifted. Switzerland was also the only participating state to chair the OSCE twice (1996, 2014), with a special request for Swiss leadership following the advent of conflict in Eastern Ukraine.

Directive Number Five issued by the Danish Chairmanship in 1997 was the final directive from this initial period of political will within OSCE leadership, marked by the ability of the HLPG to visit the NK region. This directive reiterated the importance of all previous directives, while also pushing the HLPG to be an internationally active body. It requested the creation of a quick start-up fund in preparation for quick deployment, holding on to the sentiment of 1995 that the HLPG was prepared for regional deployment.[226] This directive was in response to participating states concerns with the initial proposals presented by the HLPG in 1995. While rapid deployment was presented in the initial four PKO options, the United States critiqued the ability of the OSCE to rapidly deploy a PKO in 1996 following the presentation of initial HLPG options, asserting that it would take up to nine months to effectively deploy in theater.[227] The Danish CiO attempted to directly address the OSCE's ability to produce a PKO by implementing unilateral political will, endeavoring to construct a mechanism to address issues with the initial PKO plans.

The idea of rapid deployment presented in Directive Five also coincides with the issue of funding, which was a point of contention throughout the multinational OSCE PKO discussion. Funding became a crucial issue when the initial proposal from the HLPG in 1995 was to be three times the annual budget of the organization (in 1996 roughly $30

---

[224] Lisbon Summit: Lisbon Document 1996. December 3, 1996. Document Number: DOC.S/1/96. OSCE Open. https://www.osce.org/mc/39539. (accessed June 5, 2017). 5.
[225] Nünlist and Zogg 2017, 122.
[226] Denmark Chairman-in-Office: Chairman-in-Office Directive No 5 to the OSCE High Level Planning Group. March 13, 1997. Document Number: REF.CIO/10/97. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.
[227] USOSCE: Memorandum to HLPG from USOSCE. June 12, 1996. Document Number: REF.PC/361/96. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

million yearly budget compared to a $93-$150 million proposed PKO budget).[228] As mentioned by Vilén, while the funding was high, the value of a multinational, consensus based PKO had unparalleled legitimacy. As political will had been mobilized in 1992, funding for a PKO was also a possibility in his eyes.[229] That being said, the budget of the OSCE did rise exponentially following the Budapest Summit, jumping from around €19 million in 1995, to its highest levels ever, or about €200 million in 2000. While the HLPG proposal for an OSCE PKO cannot be viewed as the sole reason for such an increase, the overall OSCE institutional evolution and perspective to take on new fields of conflict management was clearly supported by participating states financial commitments. This trend, again not associated directly with the HLPG, does give insight to Vilén's positive attitude of the OSCE to produce a PKO costing over €100 million.

The Danish directive also paralleled further shifts in the Minsk Group Co-Chair composition. After taking over Sweden's role in 1995, Finland transferred its co-chair position to France in January 1997. Due to Azerbaijani discontent, the US was incorporated as a third co-chair in February 1997.[230] The deterioration of small state leadership in the Minsk Group can also be interpreted as part of the longer post-Cold War narrative away from the idealist narratives of the early 1990's that asserted geopolitics was no-longer a part of European security. [231] The sober realization that a plethora of narratives remained dependent on the paradigm of great power status and geo-political identity is a critical consideration. This was further amplified after 1999 over how the European security order was developing.

Danish strategic culture, according to Sten Rynning, is highly influenced by Cold War memories, as well as the opening the collapse of the Soviet Union offered Europe. Rynning asserts that Danish foreign policy makers, though understanding the limitations of being a small state and preserving human rights and democracy as core values, "retained a

---

[228] Pagani, Fabrizio (1997): Financing Peace-keeping and Peace-related Operations. The UN and the OSCE Practice. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 338.

[229] Vilén 1997, 114.

[230] RFE/RL 2006, Nagorno-Karabakh: Timeline of the Long Road to Peace.

[231] Nünlist and Zogg 2017, 122; Haar, ter Barend (2017): Dutch Narratives about Russian-Western Relations. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 95.

political ambition to affect the international environment in the long term."[232] This led to greater international activism in 1989 with a conservative government in power, attempting to promote new Danish leadership internationally. The Social Democratic Party continued this trend in 1992, purportedly due to their haunted memories of party compromise during the Cold War.[233] Danish leadership of the OSCE in 1997 can be seen as an amiable part of achieving this self-narrative. Directive Five and attempts to structure new OSCE conflict management organs, taking a leadership role in doing so, can be read as ambition in the international arena. But as Rynning argues, after formulating a strategy for achieving influence in international politics, Denmark fully turned its back on the cultivated neutrality of the 20th century. This was seen through Danish participation in military interventions abroad in an attempt to cultivate the image as a 'strategic actor', participating in the 1999 NATO air campaign in Kosovo, US interventions in Iraq, and US intervention in Libya. Like some former WP members, Denmark too used the 1990's as a period of soul searching and the OSCE as a forum for cultivating the image of a 'strategic actor'. Regardless, they seemingly drifted toward the established structures of Atlanticist security and their established position within NATO as the liminal period of European euphoria began to normalize.

Directive Six issued by the Polish CiO in 1998 only reaffirmed the importance of the HLPG and recommended further cooperation with the Minsk Group.[234] That being said, the fact that the NK conflict still came up on the CiO's radar as a priority within the first three months of taking office signified the continuing temporal importance of Nagorno-Karabakh for the OSCE. Directive Six was a stark shift from previous directives affirming the HLPG's recommendations as a foundation for all other political decision making structures within the OSCE, to simply a request for further support of the Minsk Group. This hints at declining political will for implementing the established norm of an OSCE PKO in regions other than NK. Directives asserting that the HLPG should take a secondary role in the conflict management process also implied a shift from active preparation for implementing a PKO, to reassertion of norms and structures in hope of future windows of

[232] Rynning, Sten (2010): Denmark. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 86
[233] Ibid., 86-88.
[234] Poland Chairman-in-Office: Chairman-in-Office Directive No. 6 to the OSCE HLPG. March 18, 1998. Document Number: CIO.GAL/11/98. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

opportunity. A new directive guiding HLPG work, signifying CiO dedication to the NK conflict, was not issued for the next five years, paralleling the hiatus of HLPG activity in the NK region.

Polish strategic culture is also significant in interpreting Directive Six. Poland's security perceptions in the 1990's are described by Marcin Terlikowski as a 'gray zone' with no security guarantor, as they made accession to NATO and the EU priorities in 1989, only being accepted in 1999. Terlikowski argues the memory of communism seemingly had an impact on these perceptions because in his opinion, the Polish military and Polish society marginalized Soviet propaganda and widely resented Soviet power.[235] This memory of Polish society as united against Soviet power presents the idea of occupation as a conceptual frame, which validate Polish security interest in NATO as a legitimate memory claim in the 'back to Europe' narrative.

Traditional military defense was also a key container of national identity for Terlikowski due to Poland's troubled geopolitical past, leading Polish elites in 2007 to define NATO as a cornerstone of Polish security. Poland, while also lacking general interest in international intervention, developed a keenness for conflict management operations over the years (specifically after accession to NATO) as a way of collecting security capital and benefits. Poland also supported democratic reforms in various post-Soviet states beginning in 1991, being one of the first states to call on the EU to open a monitoring mission to Georgia in 2009 after the OSCE was barred by Russia.[236] The Polish OSCE chairmanship of 1998 can be read in relation to this developing perception of security, as Directive Six shows a blasé, but potentially calculating approach to actively supporting conflict management. Poland may have been looking for a way of building security capital, while simultaneously preparing to write themselves into the existing narrative of NATO based Atlanticist security. Thus, Polish strategic culture of the 1990's, like Armenia and Azerbaijan, struggled to find a new security provider, while simultaneously looking for ways to maintain security leverage.

The period following the last HLPG pseudo-monitoring missions to the region in 1997 marked a further closing of previous windows of opportunity. The period within the

---

[235] Terlikowski, Marcin (2010): Poland. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 270-271.

[236] Ibid., 269-273.

CSCE/OSCE where Russia was as a willing negotiating partner and all member states remained actively accountable to the agreements of Paris 1990 began to fade in 1993. The window began to close with the 'Kozyrev speech' in Stockholm to end 1992 and Yeltsen's rhetoric of a privileged position for Russia in the post-Soviet Space beginning in 1993. Notwithstanding, significant institutionalization was still achieved within the CSCE, facilitating important cooperation until post Lisbon, 1996. Directives by the CiO hint at this deteriorating political will through the greater need for unilateral action from the chairman to attend to the conflict. The diminishing significance of the directives' content also supports this observation. Conversely, the need for strong leadership shaped the chairmanship position into a conflict management tool of its own, if only momentarily. For those who wanted to take responsibility in the OSCE, such as the many small states who held the position in the 1990's and early 2000's, they had limited capacity to work independently in regard to conflict resolution.

Divergence and Division

The Istanbul Summit of 1999 was a significant contextual point in the wider post-Cold War political narrative. Dissatisfaction with the authoritative role the OSCE took regarding the Chechnya conflict as well as sanctions participating states put on Russia in other regions such as Nagorno-Karabakh set the mood prior to Istanbul. At the summit, Yeltsin presented a similar rhetoric of inherent Russian internists in the former Soviet Space to what he had shown at Budapest 1994. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) was amended, but not implemented and "senior Russian military figures [had] gone further…even suggesting the US [strived] to perpetuate tension in the Caucasus, with the aim of weakening Russia on the international stage."[237] The NATO Bombings in the former Yugoslavia also marked a significant misperception of the Russian narrative by NATO countries and remains an issue of contention today.[238] Istanbul was followed by internal succession of Yeltsen by Vladimir Putin, bringing Russia a new perspective on international cooperation. Several factions within Russia still maintained faith in the OSCE

[237] Eke, Steven (1999): Analysis: East-West relations must shift. *British Broadcasting Network.* November, 19 1999. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/528362.stm, (accessed October 29, 2016).

[238] Remler, Philip (2017): United States Narrative(s). In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe: A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 176.

as a new international forum more amiable to their interests than NATO. Russian discontent during 1999 was read by some Americans as part of a longer attitude of disgruntlement with status in a new, post-Cold War world.[239] While in the Russian narrative actions taken in 1999 were a legitimate assertion of red lines, for some Americans it may have looked like diplomatic ploys in the longer struggle to regain prestige lost after the Cold War.

No HLPG directives were issued from 1999-2002. Directive Seven issued in 2003 was a reflection on the 2002 Porto Ministerial Council meeting and hope that a new window of opportunity was in the making. Directive Seven issued by the Dutch CiO requested renewed missions to the region from the HLPG, which had been inactive since 1997. All previous mandates were also requested to be updated. The wording by the Dutch CiO implied that the HLPG had done none, if any work on PKO planning from 1997-2003 because they referred to 1997 as the appropriate starting point for all future planning.[240] The request that all previous mandates be updated was a reference to the FSC debate that occurred from 2002-2003 (see FSC section) and are interpreted here as a coded response affirming the norms of 1992. Different from all previous directives discussed, there was no timetable offered for implementing the request. This could imply that the amount of work needed to bring HLPG planning up to standard was substantial and required an entirely new report on an OSCE multinational PKO. The previous recommendation report from Vilén in 1995 was over 500 pages. Directive 'Seven A' was also a significant indicator of OSCE hopes for post-conflict peace mediation. It reiterated support for HLPG plans to be drafted in general terms so that they could be the basis for any future OSCE stabilizing and peace support missions. Seven A also recommended further cooperation with the CPC, OPU, and other OSCE structures.[241] The recommendations for generic planning and further institutional integration suggested that the idealistic hope that the OSCE could continue to expand its conflict management toolbox and a consensus security model as a common narrative of European security in the post-Soviet space was still alive.

---

[239] Maresca, John J. (1985): *To Helsinki: The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 1973-1975.* Duke University Press. 55-63

[240] Netherlands Chairman-in-Office's (2003): CIO.GAL/76/03. *Directive Number 7 for the OSCE HLPG*. OSCE Restricted. July 18, 2003.

[241] Ibid.

That being said, Porto 2002 was also an important moment for a rethinking of the power of the CiO. Walter Kemp commented that the power of the CiO is largely a myth due to the mandate given at Porto, which states: 'its actions are not inconsistent with positions agreed by all the participating States.'"[242] Conversely, his investigation is largely post Porto, not commenting on the earlier responsibilities mandated after Budapest 1994. The subsequent precedents various chairmanships set for the CiO's role in institutional evolution are also not considered. These precedents, seen in the HLPG directives, gives a subtle commentary on the image of the CiO that did sustain after 2002 as a subset of the responsibilities that were cultivated in relation to the 1994 CiO mandate.

The Netherlands, as a founding member of both NATO and the EU, had a strong security identity at the end of the Cold War, though tested by the flowing perceptions of Europe. Still holding a constitutional commitment to supporting human rights and the international order, Jörg Noll and René Moelker comment that the interpretation of these values shifted in relation to domestic and European security in the 1990's. The Dutch were one of the first NATO members to modify their military model from conscription to a smaller expeditionary force. The 1995 Srebrenica massacre, where Dutch peacekeepers were unable to stop the killing of more than 7,000 Bosnians, was a primary reason for Dutch force reconsideration and modernization.[243] This experience had a profound impact on the Netherlands self-image as a conflict manager, subsequently influencing how Dutch strategic culture chose to support international order after 1995. As argued by Noll and Moelker, the Netherlands continued to participate in NATO operations and view activity in NATO, the EU, OSCE, and UN as critical. Nevertheless, strategic interests shifted more towards economic considerations and security for Dutch global economic endeavors. In turn, this degraded "the broker position it held for many decades."[244]

Directive Seven and Seven A of the Dutch chairmanship can be interpreted as an interest in keeping the OSCE PKO capabilities up to date, possibly influenced by a specific experience of security and conflict management. After the experience of 1995 at

---

[242] Kemp, Walter (2009): The OSCE Chairmanship: Captain or Figurehead? *Security and Human Rights.* No. 9. 9.

[243] Noll, Jörg and Moelker, René (2010): Netherlands. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 255-256.

[244] Ibid., 262, 264.

Srebrenica, the Netherlands understood what could happen if outdated force structures and planning were the basis for a peacekeeping operation. At the same time, Barend argues that Dutch foreign policy, as it was 40 years ago, remains largely reactive, rather than active.[245] In this frame, Directive Seven and Seven A should be considered in line with larger support for OSCE institutionalization, as well as the 2002 FSC debate that reinvigorated political will. As various Dutch narratives looked to make an impact on the world, the reinvigorated PKO debate and the Dutch CiO of 2003 offered an opportunity to write NK mediation and wider OSCE institutionalization into this narrative.

Directive Seven and the FSC Debate of 2002-2003 followed US attempt to restart negotiations in the Minsk Group by bringing all parties to Key West Florida in 2001. With renewed interest from the new Bush Administration to find a solution for Nagorno-Karabakh, the US subsequently hosted negotiations under the auspices of the Minsk Group at Key West on April 3, three months after President Bush's inauguration. The US signaled their prioritization of the South Caucasus, when U.S. Ambassador and Minsk Group Co-Chair Carey Cavanaugh referred to Key West as "'a bold and significant step forward.'" [246] This may have been read by Russia as renewed American efforts to change the RSC dynamic in the South Caucasus, potentially securitizing what had become a relatively frozen RSC. On the other hand, some actors within the American Foreign Policy community consider NK a forum where the US and Russia build trust, potentially making Key West an olive branch in the American narrative after 1999.

While the negotiations of 2001 were unsuccessful, they signified interest from the US. Russia's subsequent actions within OSCE forums to restart the PKO debate on command and control are interpreted here as nervous vigor. Thus, Directive Seven was a further spark to the OSCE PKO debate, in support of previously established norms. Though the US was able to stimulate international interest in NK following a period when political will had stagnated from 1997-2001, actual functionality of the OSCE in terms of the FA and OSCE norms needed to be engaged by small states. The Porto Ministerial Meetings of 2002, Maastricht in 2003, and the Dutch Chairmanship of 2003 all represent the re-application of interest by small states in sustaining the norms established in the 1990's.

---

[245] Haar 2017, 91.

[246] Peuch, Jean-Christophe (2001): Armenia/Azerbaijan: International Mediators Report Progress on Karabakh Dispute. *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty.* April 10, 2001. https://www.rferl.org/a/1096184.html. (accessed May 30, 2017).

The HLPG did not implement Directive Seven, subsequently questioning HLPG functionality after five years of stagnation. Vilén commented that if operation planning did not occur, participating states would not take an active interest in the conflict. While this noted the low period of political will from 1997-2001, it also hinted at the related conclusion that without member states interest, the planning of the HLPG also stagnated. In his writings after being HLPG chair, Vilén mentioned that operation planning progress had a positive effect on the parties' willingness to agree to a political solution. The stagnation of the HLPG from 1997-2000 causes the possibility of a lost opportunity in conflict resolution at Key West in 2001. It also could have influenced the OSCE's ability to review 1995 recommendations in a timely manner because so much had changed on the ground that neither participating states nor the HLPG were aware of.

Vilén also commented after his tenure as HLPG chair that the perspective of the OSCE changed due to the Yugoslav conflicts. The initial goal of the HLPG had been solely military, but as the institution matured and consolidated, an OSCE PKO became an economic, humanitarian, political, arms control, and military project.[247] Even when attention was refocused on the HLPG in 2002-2003 through the renewed interest in the conflict stemming from FSC debates and the various CiO directives, it seemed to take a substantial period of time for the HLPG to catch up with greater OSCE modernization.

HLPG Epilog

Directive Number Eight issued by the Slovenian Chairmanship in 2005 restated the faith of the Dutch CiO from 2003, also showing that the hope for a new window of opportunity was still only hope. The HLPG was again requested to revisit the region, implying that the HLPG had still not fulfilled the requests from Directive Seven. A new request was submitted, detailing that the HLPG should take on new responsibility and monitor the line of contact (LOC) in cooperation with the CiO Special Representative to the Minsk Group. Operational Concept 1-4, from General Vilén's original PKO proposal were requested for review, reiterating the call from the Dutch chairman that the entire PKO proposal from the 1990's be reexamined and reformed for the current decade.[248] The fact that the HLPG did not act immediately to the request of the Dutch chairman in 2003 allows

[247] Vilén 1997, 111, 112

[248] Slovenia Chairman-in-Office: Chairmanship's Directive Number 8 for the OSCE HLPG. June 22, 2005. Document Number: CIO.GAL/98/05. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

for interpretation of what the political will within the OSCE was like in that historic period. The lack of OSCE military personnel visiting the region also raises the question of how Russia's image of the region changed with OSCE disengagement from a regrouping South Caucasus RSC. If read through the lens of Russian military modernization, this may have endowed the self-narrative reaffirmed in 1992 that this region was governed by Russian security politics. This could have been a reason for the HLPG taking three years to achieve the Dutch request for new visits to the region. OSCE military personnel may have become a more securitized issue after their absence became the new normal from 1997-2005. Irrespective, the OSCE established offices in Yerevan and Baku in 2000, further nuancing the idea of which norms of security were securitized. Human rights issues, while remaining a tender issue for Russia due to Chechnya, may not have been as securitized within the context of OSCE missions at this moment. Notwithstanding, the work of the Netherlands and Slovenia was a direct reassertion of agreed upon norms from 1992 and 1995; the norm that the OSCE would be the primary mediation structure as well as the guarantor of peace after political agreements were agreed upon.

2007 confirmed that the directives from 2003 and 2005 were again only faith that a new window of opportunity would soon open. Directive Nine from the Spanish Chairmanship asserted that the new mandate was created in cooperation with all representatives of the Minsk Group and all future work of the HLPG should be focused on recon and monitoring the LOC.[249] These tempered requests showed that the political will of the conflicting parties did not materialize when the OSCE hoped it would after 2003 and 2005. Spain also reasserted it priorities as CiO, which were: priorities, perseverance, and patience. This mantra was the embodiment of reasserting mundane directives and mandates to sustain the norms of the 1990's in hope of a future window of opportunity. There was hope that 2001 would be the beginning of a new mobilization of political will in regards to NK. Small states were able to sustain norms and reaffirm inter-dimensional peacekeeping, but they were unable to muster consensus and ripeness similar to that seen in the early 1990's.

[249] Spanish Chairman-in-Office: Statement Delivered by the Chairperson of the Permanent Council on the Chairman-in-Office's Directive No. 9 for the OSCE HLPG at the 659th Meeting of the Permanent Council. March 29, 2007. Document Number: CIO/GAL/49/07. OSCE +. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Within the first month of their chairmanship, Finland implemented Directive Ten. While the directive was very similar to the Spanish directive, it requested that the HLPG maintain a conceptual basis for implementing a PKO, showing continued vision for wider OSCE PKO tools.[250] While there was not much substantiality added to the HLPG mission through Directive Ten, Finland did fight hard to acquire budgetary funding for the HLPG to have a permanent office in Vienna. This further solidified the concept of the HLPG as a permanent organ of the OSCE with potential to sustain post conflict resolution in Nagorno-Karabakh. Contextually speaking, this was on the eve of the 2008 Georgia war and Putin's 2007 Munich Security Conference warning to the West. Munich 2007 was significant because not only did President Putin argue against the perceptions of growing American predominance, but also against the OSCE's growing bureaucratic bias.[251] Putin directly reaffirmed the sanctity of internal affairs, accusing the OSCE institution of taking on an unequal role in promoting the human dimension. Putin's account of how the OSCE was developing again supports argumentation that Russia considered OSCE involvement in a perceived Russian RSC as a securitized issue, with specific regard to the human dimension. OSCE norms and institutionalization of the 1990's and early 2000's were challenged by growing Russian dissatisfaction with existing European narratives of security. The Georgia War also seemed to mark a decline in OSCE member states' interest in the OSCE as a primary conflict management organ, with the EU forced to step in as the main conflict manager. If the common narrative of European security had not died in 1999 in Istanbul, it was in critical condition as of 2008.

The narrative of the various directives spanning from 1992-2008 show a defined reassertion of previous norms by small states. Hungary, Switzerland, Poland, Denmark, and the Netherlands all worked unilaterally within the OSCE to sustain norms that had previously been established in periods of high political will. The OSCE constantly fought with its internal identity of being a consensus based organization, with institutional organs and small states finding new ways to continually build the OSCE's structural capacity and conflict management toolbox. These structures created an environment where the legitimacy of a consensus based security order could be harnessed during new historic

---

[250] Finland Chairman-in-Office: Directive 10 of the OSCE Chairmanship-in-Office for the HLPG. January 30, 2008. Document Number: CIO.GAL/24/08. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[251] Putin, Vladimir (2007): Выступление и дискуссия на Мюнхенской конференции по вопросам политики безопасности – Speech and discussion at the Munich Security Conference. *президент России – President of Russia*. http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034. (accessed April 25, 2018).

windows of opportunity. Though perceptions of a common European security narrative clearly diverged from where they had been in 1990, how the OSCE institutionalized and who sustained norms showed that the process had persisted. Much like the N+N block of the CSCE process, small states from 1990-2004 maintained norms and institutional continuity during periods of low political will.

4.2 CPC - Conflict Prevention Center

One of the first CSCE structures to develop in the early 1990's and arguably the most important to the identity and practicality of the CSCE/OSCE, was the Conflict Prevention Center (CPC). Though the primary negotiations for Nagorno-Karabakh within the Minsk Group are political and diplomatic, the CPC is mandated with ensuring the functional aspects of any agreement. The CPC represents one of the two OSCE organs currently tasked with implementing the PKO and larger conflict management initiatives that grew out of the early 1990's. This narrative will work as a contextual foundation for understanding the OSCE's focus on operational matters and interest in a PKO in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Building a Foundation

The CPC gained its mandate at the 1990 Charter of Paris, where the functionality of the organ began to be shaped. In its initial form, the CPC was tasked with facilitating confidence and security building measures (CSBMs) between member states, creating a communications network for dispersing and collecting information in this sphere. Arguably, this was one of the most significant points of cooperation post 1975 and continues to be one of the institutional priorities to this day.[252] The Paris document moved to make the free flow of military information an institutional priority and function by creating a secretariat in pursuit of these activities. This new office included a director and two officers to oversee the process, as well as an open amount of administrative and technical personnel for implementing structural components. The CPC's first chair was Yugoslavia, who was a major proponent of a potential CPC during the 1973-75 CSCE process. During the CSCE process, Yugoslavia lobbied for the sharing of military information among participating states, which became one of the first responsibilities of the

[252] Lehne 1991, 19.

CPC.[253] Ominously, Yugoslavia soon dissolved, becoming one of the first tests of CSCE conflict management and the CPC.

The construction of a CPC was the antithesis to the expansion of old institutions such as NATO, preferred by the first Bush administration to maintain American input in European affairs. Though the CSCE was not a completely new player in European security politics, attempting to build new institutions on what had only previously been a 'traveling circus,' was something that did not exude confidence from the US or those with a vested interest in a NATO security community.

The following year, at the first meeting of the Council of Ministers in Berlin, the CPC was again chosen to facilitate the functionality of a CSCE vision that had been initiated in congress with the Helsinki Final Act of 1975. From 1978-1992, the CSCE assembled Meeting of Experts on the peaceful settlement of disputes (PSD), to collect best practices and facilitate regional practitioners. The process began in 1978 Montreux, Switzerland where eight general points for dialog were established for conflict resolution. The PSD, which was a Swiss initiative first raised during the CSCE process in Geneva 1973, became one of the CSCE's conflict resolution tools in the early 1990's. It would be at the Malta meetings in 1991 that the points of 1978 were expanded and written into provisions for a CSCE procedure for political settlements of disputes. This outlined a functional diplomatic mechanism to enact what had only been theory over the past 25 years.[254] Participating states' ministers at Berlin in 1991 tasked the newly created CPC with being the nominating institution, responsible for administrating the new PSD procedures and forums, known as the Valletta Mechanism.[255] Though these institutions did not grown to be the cornerstone of a new OSCE, as the Valletta Mechanism has never been implemented, it was a signal of a new political will and a test of member states willingness to further institutionalize the CPC.[256] Though there were few practical implications of these early initiatives, they represent the "euphoria in Europe about the specific European

---

[253] Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Paris, France November 19-20, 1990. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/39516. (accessed August 1, 2017). 17-18.
[254] Peaceful Settlement of Disputes: report of the CSCE meeting of experts on peaceful settlement of disputes. Valletta, Malta. February 8, 1991. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/secretariat/30115. (accessed August 7, 2017). 1-2.
[255] OSCE Secretariat's Conflict Prevention Centre, Operations Service (CPC/OS): OSCE Mechanisms & Procedures: Summary/ Compendium. Vienna, Austria. September 14, 2011. Document Number: SEC.GAL/132/11. OSCE Open. https://www.osce.org/cpc/34427. (accessed May 25, 2017). 30, 116.
[256] Lehne 1991, 24.

essence about democracy and the rule of law."[257] They also contextualize the OSCE's intent to take on harder security measures and involvement in the NK conflict within a wider story of institutionalization.

Pushing forward, the Prague meetings of the Council of Ministers furthered the agenda and ambition for the CPC as a primary CSCE conflict management tool. While Berlin may have represented a specific European essence of democracy and rule of law, Prague in 1992 represented more practical measures. The council requested the Consulting Committee of the CPC "serve as a forum in the security field wherein the CSCE participating states will conduct comprehensive and regular consultations on security issues with politico-military implications." The CPC became responsible for implementing all fact finding missions and conducting multilateral cooperation with international institutions such as the UN, NATO, and Western European Union.[258] The ambitions not only shaped the CPC, they also planted seeds for future forums that would be pivotal in the ongoing negotiation of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The Consulting Committee after 1993 became the Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) and a leading forum for consistently discussing political-military affairs among participating states.[259]

The idea that the CPC should be a structure for leading cooperation with external institutions was also intriguing. Throughout the NK negotiation process, a narrative of cooperation with the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and other post-Soviet security structures emerged as a result of the competition shown in chapter two. This potential cooperation, as shown in the third party PKO discussion, questioned and amended the vision various participating states may have had for the CSCE. Because of the NATO aspirations of former WP countries, as well as the pro-NATO preference from the US, it is plausible that the CSCE had to position itself within a growing EU institutional RSC to achieve its short term goals of institutionalization. There was also the simultaneous need to incorporate the diverging Russian narrative into the consolidated 'back to Europe' mantra. Due to these differences, the CPC in a sense became polemic, none the less making efforts

[257] Tomuschat, Christian (2014): What is the OSCE Court of Conciliation and Arbitration? Interviewed by OSCE. August 22, 2014. https://www.osce.org/cca/122915. (accessed June 15, 2017).
[258] Prague Document on Further Development of CSCE Institutions and Structures; Declaration on Non-Proliferation and Arms Transfers. Second Meeting of the Council; Summary of Conclusions. OSCE Open. 18.
[259] OSCE Secretariat's Conflict Prevention Centre, Operations Service (CPC/OS): OSCE Mechanisms & Procedures: Summary/ Compendium. OSCE Open. 33.

to validate Russian concerns.[260] To observers at the time, it seemed that the participating states pursued these goals tentatively and with little actual knowledge of how to apply these new strategies in Russia's perceived RSC.[261] Regardless of the conviction of political will, the decisions made in Prague put the CPC at the center of future institutionalization and the OSCE's perceived ability to enforce conflict mediation, contesting NATO dominance.

With the traction gained in January 1992, the determination to continue the democratization of diplomacy continued with the Helsinki Summit and the Third Meeting of Ministers in Stockholm in December of the same year. With the overarching vision of improving the capacity of CSCE conflict mediations mechanisms, such as the CPC, there was a dedication to internalizing the 'European essence of democracy,' without creating an overly bureaucratic structure. The second Helsinki Summit showed political will for further institutionalization as well as international recognition of the structures that were being built, specifically the CPC and Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR). There were also further conversations among participating states about a more developed communications network for emergency situations to be incorporated into the CPC structure to complement the communication network used for sharing military information (based on the original Yugoslav proposal in 1973-75). Finally, regarding CSCE entrance into the field of peacekeeping, the CPC was mandated with beginning the early planning stages and collecting recommendations for financial modalities for a PKO.[262] This request was part of the larger narrative of institutionalization and creation of a chain of command within the institution to strengthen the multinational secretariat.

Helsinki II paralleled the shifting relations between Russia and the CSCE regarding Russia's right to mediate conflicts in its perceived RSC. The Helsinki Summit and additional mandates for the CPC represented a direct response to the Italian Villa Madama emergency preliminary meetings in June of 1992 (see page 42-43). These initial meetings of the CSCE Minsk Group brought the issues of a CSCE PKO and a comprehensive CSCE involvement in the traditionally Soviet RSC into the lime light. Villa Madama also hinted at how different member states' interests might dictate conflict mediation, especially if there

[260] Lehne 1991, 29.
[261] Ibid., 30.
[262] CSCE Helsinki Document 1992: The Challenges of Change. Helsinki, Finland. July 9-10, 1992. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/39530. (accessed June 29, 2017). 15.

was no set structure or process in place.[263] Helsinki was an attempt to address the informal conversations begun in Rome. With more formal, structural measures taken in general forums, the power of individual member states in any mediation process was theoretically limited.

The functional aspects of the requests made in July at Helsinki were internally fulfilled in Stockholm that December. It was this concluding document that publicly furthered the conversation on potential forms of peacekeeping at the ministerial level, requesting "the Conflict Prevention Centre to take rapid steps to strengthen its ability to provide operational support for CSCE preventive diplomacy missions and peacekeeping activities."[264] The missed opportunity for a political agreement between Armenia and Azerbaijan at Stockholm also represented a further realization that there needed to be firm commitments from the CSCE regarding security guaranties following any political agreement. As the conflict of mediation between the CSCE and Russia escalated, the CSCE understood the need to present itself as a legitimate security provider through institutional ability:

> They [the Ministers] reviewed experience with the instruments for early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management, in particular in the field of preventive diplomacy. They noted that, in association with efforts to bring about political solutions, stability can be enhanced by armed contingents for peacekeeping purposes.[265]

The commentary on a further PKO to specifically include the possibility of armed contingents highlighted the faction of participating states pushing for a firmer stand by the CSCE in terms of a functional aspect of the institution. In the context of the 'Kozyrev speech' and Russia's warning of what 1993 would look like, a presentation of the CSCE's potential interest in developing hard security measures was a statement on the gravity participating states ascribed to the CSCE as a legitimate security provider in a traditionally Russian RSC.

The tempered response by the participating states at Helsinki and Stockholm in July and December 1992 was a reflection of the political will exhibited in Rome surrounding preliminary NK talks. It also displayed an understanding of the political impact creating

---

[263] Emergency Preliminary Meetings of the Minsk Group of the CSCE. Second Session, Third Day. OSCE Restricted.
[264] Third Meeting of the Council: Summary of Conclusions, Decision on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. 16.
[265] Ibid., 15.

such structures and concrete powers could have on specific member states. The CSCE was finding its place in a post-Cold War order and began to shift its focus from stabilizing solely Europe, to a wider perspective. Though it was slow and not at a pace necessary to capitalize on windows of opportunity in conflicts such as Karabakh, af Ugglas recalled in 1993, "we are making steady but unspectacular progress in improving the conflict management capability of the international community."[266]

The culmination of these four years of political will and what was defined as a democratic euphoria following the end of the Cold War climaxed in Budapest and the subsequent Hungarian Chairmanship. The conference moved to make itself an organization, seeking a special place in the new post-Cold War order.[267]

Nuancing the Foundation

Following Budapest, mention of CPC institutionalization began to decrease in Ministerial Council meetings and summits. The Lisbon Summit in 1996 lacked the traditional subjection of OSCE institutions to constant revision, representing a conceptual stabilization of the OSCE conflict management foundation.[268] While the mention of peacekeeping had a deep, reflective conversation from 1996-2003 in a variety of forums including the FSC, the initial search for institutional legitimacy through functionality seemed to have been achieved. New developments from 1996-2003 influenced the ongoing evolution of the CPC, but the most significant advancements shaped by consensus political will were achieved prior to the Lisbon Summit of 1996. The post-1996 CPC evolution was only a reaffirmation of prior values, defenses of said values, and institutional support for previously agreed upon norms and mandates in the face of marginal and regressive political will. The CPC became the foundation of functionality and institutional ability necessary for all future debates on the PKO mandate.

Many of the FSC and HLPG concerns from 1995-2000 were reflected in an administrative shift in the CPC around 2000, when the OSCE had its largest budget in history. For example, as of 1998, the CPC began taking further responsibility for functional aspects of a larger OSCE bureaucracy when the Permanent Council (PC- principle decision

---

[266] Af Ugglas 1994, 11.
[267] Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. 1-5.
[268] Bothe; Ronzitti; Rosas (ed.) 1997, 511.

making body of the OSCE) decided to merge the CPC with the Department of General Affairs.[269] While the substance of conflict resolution debates occurred in the political forums such as the Minsk Group, functional capacities continued to develop and be streamlined within the CPC. As a consequence, the CPC cultivated a voice of authority on the OSCE's functional ability to implement any political agreement.

In line with this trend of institutionalization, an Operation Centre was set up in 2000, serving "as a planning cell for future missions and field operations; it prepares the deployment of new missions/field operations in case the Permanent Council has decided on such an operation."[270] There were also minor reorganizations within the Mission Program Section (MPS), or the department of the CPC responsible for all OSCE field missions. These bureaucratic reorganizations renamed the MPS program director the deputy director of the CPC, further intertwining the significance of field operations with the organizations overall conflict management mandate. The change to field operation structures within the CPC was significant because these shifts, in a period of financial support for the institution, can be viewed as another way of internalizing norms of functional conflict management.

This further CPC institutionalization can be seen as an indirect response to the commentary by the US and other participating states concerning the funding and command structure of an OSCE PKO. As the CPC was mandated to facilitate the command structure of any PKO, the stability and strength of the CPC signified an interest in lasting mediation efforts and eventual post-conflict rehabilitation similar to the proven OSCE mission program model. The continued strengthening of the CPC also allowed the institution to take stronger stances on the OSCE's ability to implement any hypothetical multinational OSCE PKOs. This will be seen in the FSC debate where the voice of the CPC's Operation Planning Unit (OPU) further highlights the ability of the CPC to realize the PKO mandate, even when consistent doubt was present from participating states.

As of 2004, the CPC constructed a multitude of subsections. There was: a liaison for OSCE Field Activities in the MPS mentioned earlier, a project planning, evaluation and development area from the Project Co-ordination Cell (PCC), operation planning and

---

[269] OSCE Permanent Council: Decision No. 257. 186th Plenary Meeting, PC Journal No. 186, Agenda item 5. October 1, 1998. Document Number: PC.DEC/257. OSCE Open. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[270] OSCE Permanent Council: Decision No. 364 Strengthening of OSCE Operational Capacities (React, Operation Centre, Restructuring of the OSCE Secretariat). 289th Plenary Meeting. PC Journal No. 289, Agenda item 2. June 29, 2000. Document Number: PC.DEC/364. OSCE Open. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

analysis from the Operations Planning Unit (OPU), a situation room for 24-hour contact between senior staff and field operations, a FSC Support Unit (FSC SU) for analysis and support of small arms and light weapons initiatives, and the original OSCE communications network. By 2004, the CPC amassed a substantial functional ability and readiness to maintain and deploy field operations. Though the perception and purpose of field operations regarding their implications among member states constantly differed, they continue to be the cornerstone of the OSCE.[271] These structures gave the OSCE ability to fulfill mandates agreed upon my member states, but also the ability to offer alternative forums for political dialog when political will declined in specific venues. Thus, when diplomacy fails in one forum, the institution can play a role and facilitate continued discussion and progress on the same issue from different angels in other forums.

Even as the CPC continued to grow and give indirect support for a political solution in Nagorno-Karabakh, the institution was still restricted by its mandates. With the opening of OSCE missions in Armenia and Azerbaijan in the early 2000's, the OSCE continued its multifaceted approach to supporting a political resolution. Though these offices were not associated with the Minsk Group negotiations, they did deal with democratization and human rights, while also supporting the long term goal of enhancing social reconciliation.[272] This perspective of Special Representative Andrzej Kasprzyk, though often viewed as an excuse for not taking concrete action, coincides with a longer vision of post-Cold War OSCE multidimensional conflict mediation. His account aligns with the general premises of preventative diplomacy as a model for engaging in long term mediation associated with stability and nation building. This idealist vision was also meet with fears from Russia. Russian Ambassador to the OSCE from 2004-2008, Alexey Borodavkin, commented that the equality of the three dimensions had been eroded and the OSCE was spending and unfair amount of resources to act East of Vienna.[273] This account highlights a part of the Russian narrative where human rights were becoming increasingly securitized. Subsequently Borodavkin's account helps understand how Russia might have come to interpret ongoing OSCE involvement in the region as well as future institutional evolution

---

[271] Zellner, Wolfgang and Evers, Frank (2014): *The Future of OSCE Field Operations (Options).* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions. Berlin, Germany. 3

[272] Kasprzyk, Andrzej and Mient-Jan Faber (2003): "How Should the OSCE Deal With the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict?" *Helsinki Monitor,* Vol. 14, Is. 1. Netherlands Helsinki Committee. 2-3.

[273] Borodavkin, Alexey (2005): "Russia, OSCE Should Shed 'Mentors' and 'Problem Children' Posture." Interviewed by the Finnish Committee for European Security– STETE. *OSCE Review.* Vol. 13, No. 1. 6-7

for addressing conflict East of Vienna, such as the PKO debate. If observed from the perspective of nation building and security, human rights issues may have also been securitized because of the narrative (conscious or subconscious) Russia remembered regarding their role in the establishment of Armenian and Azerbaijani national and states consciousness. With the OSCE bringing a new set of values to the region, uncertainty about what impact this would have on both nations, as well as their strategic culture, may have led to the further securitization of OSCE involvement in Russian security culture.

While small states worked to create the CSCE as a cooperative conflict management forum and a new structure for European security, counter efforts also worked to maintain status quo structures. As former WP states gained access to NATO and the EC in 2004, the OSCE as an institution had to work much harder than the CSCE as a forum to sustain prominence. Thus, the narrative of the OSCE and mediation of Nagorno-Karabakh post 1999 took on a new character. Ideals of collective security shifted in meaning with NATO and the EU again expanding, changing the perceptions of a European security environment and how different actors wanted to define European Security.

4.3 FSC – Forum for Security Cooperation

The FSC evolved out of the Consultative Committee (CC) of the CPC. The CC, which gained its mandate at Paris 1990, was tasked with being the CSCE's all-inclusive forum for arms negotiations until Helsinki 1992. It was the most comprehensive body of the CSCE so far, tasked with meeting at least once a month with a monthly rotating chair. It was responsible for being the member states' voice in the activities of the new CPC. The work of the CC was highly ambitious at the time, with the CC being politically responsible for the functionality of the CPC, which in turn was responsible for all CSBM's and the CSCE communications network (exchange of military information). The intent was to make an independent forum for ongoing Basket I negotiations, which was a primary focus of the CSCE prior to 1990.[274] The CC was only considered a temporary forum, coinciding with the understanding arrived at in Paris 1990, that the CSCE would need continual institutional evolution to meet the security needs of a shifting Europe.

At Helsinki II 1992, the FSC became one of the central forums of the CSCE/OSCE as a first-basket arms control forum. With the shifting nature of the CSCE, conflict in the

[274] Charter of Paris for a New Europe. OSCE Open. 17.

CSCE area, and the need for a security guarantor in the NIS, "the participating States have decided to establish a new CSCE Forum for Security Co-operation, with a strengthened Conflict Prevention Centre, as an integral part of the CSCE."[275] In parallel with CPC consolidation, the new FSC as an independent forum allowed the CPC to focus on preventative diplomacy and conflict prevention as an inter-basket (disciplinary) project. This evolution continued to become controversial in the view of the Russian Federation, as they voiced their opinion various times that security was a purely Basket I issue.[276] This perception of the CSCE as a competing security provider via Basket III initiatives in the NIS, presented itself in various RF FSC statement, influencing how and where a NK PKO was debated and consequently, how the CSCE/OSCE evolved.

At the Lisbon Summit in 1996, the FSC gained a mandated to utilize funds from the CPC that allowed it to take formal actions, further defining the capacity of OSCE Basket I conflict mediation. Also at Lisbon, the region ability of the FSC was further defined in terms of conflict prevention, stating that "in particular, the FSC may look at ways at making more effective use of its decision on 'Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations'."[277] With initial intent of the FSC to support the communication aspects (Open Skies and CBSM) of the CPC, the eventual growth of the FSC out of its initial purpose comments on the ambitious nature of CSCE/OSCE evolution. It also underscored the ability of specific participating states to position themselves to influence the evolution of these forums away from, or towards, inter-basket security measures, thus setting conditions for competing visions of how collective security should be defined. Therefore, the way in which the new FSC interacted with the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict after 1996 exhibited this evolution, further commenting on Halonen's assertion that the NK conflict stood as a historic acid test for the OSCE.[278]

The PKO Debate 10 Years On

After the Porto Ministerial Conference of 2002, the FSC was tasked with facilitating the review of the OSCE's role in the field of peacekeeping. While the CSCE/OSCE played

[275] CSCE Helsinki Document 1992: The Challenges of Change. OSCE Open. 19.
[276] Godzimirski, Jakub M. (2009): Russia and the OSCE: From High Expectations to Denial? In: Torjesen, Stina and Rowe, Elana Wilson (ed.) *The Multilateral Dimension in Russian Foreign Policy.* Routledge 2009. 126.
[277] Lisbon Summit: Lisbon Document 1996. OSCE Open. 23-24.
[278] Halonen 1997, 15.

a large role in the Yugoslav conflict, as well as various other post-Soviet conflicts, the implementation of hard security guaranties, such as multinational peacekeeping battalions, had yet to occur. The Porto final document points to the formal acknowledgment of an interest in a renewed political process surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh by participating states, requesting a reflection on the 1992 Helsinki mandate for peacekeeping. It also highlighted Russia's part in restarting the PKO debate.[279] Hence, this documented marked the beginning of a period of renewed political interest in discussing the peacekeeping mandate within OSCE political forums.

Though 2002 Porto showed a renewed spark for political dialogue, the OSCE still needed to overcome the historic disagreement from various delegations, especially the Americans and Russians, about the ability of the OSCE to produce hard security measures. Prior to the Porto mandate in 2002, the Russian delegation brought up the issue of a PKO in the FSC. Once through a food for thought paper and once critiquing the lack of political debate that occurred (or had not occurred) on the issue over the past five years. The food for thought paper outlined Russia's interest in resurrecting the idea that any OSCE PKO should be subordinate to other international or regional structures, such as the UN or CIS because of their practical experience with PKOs.[280] By validating an OSCE PKO through the UN or CIS, Russia would effectively gain the potential for use of force, or direct command and control over any CIS PKO. This once again opened the possibility of attaining one, if not two, of their outstanding concerns from Budapest 1994.

Member of the Russian delegation Andrei Vorobiev went on to state that Russia believed the 1992 mandate to be outdated and any PKO should be planned and implemented by the PC with close cooperation with the FSC.[281] The new structure for PKO planning and implementation proposed by the Russian Federation would directly contradict the purpose of OSCE institutional evolution and consolidation that occurred from 1990-2002. Restructuring a command structure as such would also negate the need for an

---

[279] Porto Ministerial Declaration, Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council. Porto, Portugal. December 6-7, 2002. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40521. (accessed August 1, 2017). 42, 83.

[280] Russian Federation Delegation: Guidelines for the OSCE Peacekeeping Operations and Formation/Functioning of its Peacekeeping Forces (RF). July 17, 2002. Original: Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/449/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[281] Russian Federation Delegation: Statement by Mr. Andrei Vorobiev, Member of the Delegation of the Russian Federation at the Vienna Talks on Military Security and Arms Control, at the Plenary Meeting of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-Operation. July 17, 2002. Original: Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/448/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

independent military planning arm, such as the HLPG, and further privilege the first-dimension of security by elevating the status of the FSC in any new PKO mandate. Favoring the FSC in PKO planning would also give Russia a stronger bilateral voice in PKO organization.

While this is apparent in particular archival documents, these points were not lost on participating states of the time. The Swiss delegation responded to the Russian delegation in the first week of October leading up to the Porto Ministerial Meeting in December, questioning the need for change in the command and control structure of any potential PKO.[282] As this questioning restarted debate that had faltered in 1995, Switzerland's initiatives throughout this period can be taken as part of the Swiss narrative's turn back to credible impartiality. This supported both the integrity of institutional evolution, as well as attempts to incorporation the Russia narrative into the dominant strains of European security that began to solidify after the 1990's. The possibility of a renewed PKO debate also offered hope for minimal cooperation after the break seen in 1999.

Following the statement by the Swiss delegation, the Armenian Delegation also responded to the Russian Food-For-Thought-Paper the preceding week. In the Armenian comments, there is alignment with Russia in saying that the 1992 PKO mandate had never been implemented and needed to be reviewed. At the same time, they reaffirmed support for the HLPG and its application outside of the NK region, with the possibility of cooperation with other international organizations. [283] This statement was outwardly coded with loyalty to Russian as a regional security guarantor by alluding to the third party PKO debate of 1992-1993. It also subtly distorted Russian goals by neglecting to mention the HLPG as subordinate to the Minsk Group, similar to Directive Six, treating the HLPG as an independent OSCE organ and supporting its work in a wider institutional context. This tactic of allegiance and parallel openness to an alternative security guarantor if the situation arose was similar to the presentation the Armenian delegation put on at the Villa Madama emergency meetings of the Minsk Group in Rome, 1992. This also possibly highlights the

---

[282] Swiss Delegation: Guidelines for the OSCE Peacekeeping Operations and Formation/Functioning of its Peacekeeping Forces (Food-for-Thought-Paper by the Russian Delegation; FSC.DEL/449/02 17 July 2002). October 2, 2002. Document Number: FSC.DEL/535/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[283] Armenian Delegation: Statement on Possible OSCE Role in Peacekeeping Delivered by Ambassador J. Tabibian at the Forum for Security Cooperation. October 7, 2002. Document Number: *FSC.DEL/541/02.* OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

solidification of a new strategic culture in Armenia, acknowledging Russia's inherent position as a RSC center,[284] but also looking to international organizations for potential leverage in domestic policy due to its dependence on regional security.

The re-initiation of the PKO debate in the summer of 2002 was directly addressed by the Council of Ministers at Porto in December. A review of the 1992 PKO mandate became an OSCE priority for 2003, with the FSC requested as a primary actor in this process. This invigorated debate, allowing for further political and institutional evolution. Beginning in 2003, the FSC began creating new structural forums for the discussion and review of the OSCE's capacity to implement the 1992 PKO mandate. Three new working groups, or Chef de files, were assigned to oversee three thematic clusters: 1) FSC contributions to the role in the field of peacekeeping operations 2) FSC contribution for the annual security review conference 3) FSC contribution for the OSCE strategy on threat and challenges to security for the 21st century. From looking at the priorities of the working groups initiated after Porto, the FSC showed broad interest in taking a more active role in OSCE application of peacekeeping norms. It is also interesting to note that while Russia was the first to express interest in such a process, the Russian Federation was not responsible for chairing any of the FSC Chef de file groups. Rather the Swedish, Belarusian, and Belgium delegation took responsibility for chairing the groups respectively.[285] These leadership positions give the impression that the questions raised by the Swiss delegation were taken seriously, reinvigorating political interest surrounding the OSCE PKO mandate.

The Finnish delegation subsequently created the informal Group of Friends within the FSC. This working group, chaired by the Finnish Ambassador, served as a forum for participating states to present their perspectives, as well as the three Chief de Files to report back to the broader assembly. This support for the OSCE PKO fits into a longer narrative of Finland in the OSCE, sustaining to this day with the assertion as of 2015 that the PKO

[284] Torosyan, Tigran and Vardanyan, Arax (2015): The South Caucasus Conflicts in the Context of Struggle for the Eurasian Heartland. *Geopolitics*. Vol. 20, No.3. 570

[285] FSC: Chair's Perception on terms of Chef de files. February 5, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/28/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

plans for any peace in Nagorno-Karabakh remain in the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.[286]

As the Swiss delegation tempered the discussion the year before, they also framed the beginning of the 2003 FSC debates with similar conceptual questions. In February of 2003 the Swiss delegation outlined the collective purpose as a need to answer the following questions: when comparing 1992 and 2003, what is qualitatively and quantitatively different? What would implementing the 1992 PKO mandate imply for the institution, as well as existing instruments such as the HLPG? Is this mandate still valid in ensuring peace in troubled regions? What are the needs and the limitations for the OSCE in going beyond this mandate? Should the OSCE commit itself to extensive peacekeeping, or should it focus on its limited peacekeeping experiences from the last decade?[287] These questions were fundamental in framing the debate throughout 2003, not only questioning the OSCE's vision for a wider security architecture, but also asking if the existing norms and mandates that were created with high political will could be and should be discarded. Because of the unfinished nature of the NK negotiation process, a reassessment of institutional norms and values could have had detrimental effects on the legitimacy of the OSCE as a security guarantor in the region. Switzerland was effectively playing the role of mediator, making room for a PKO debate to be revived, simultaneously placing Russian initiatives in a larger historic context and using the opportunity for institutional reflection.

In the same informal meeting of friends, the Spanish Delegation requested that there be a conversation about PKOs as a subsidiary to peace-building.[288] This remark is interpreted as a commitment to the interdisciplinary nature of OSCE conflict resolution and hope that the form of preventative diplomacy and interdimensional security that had evolved over the past decade would sustain. It is also seen as interest in sustaining such conflict management tools so that they would not be abandoned simply for a prioritization of Basket I. This interpretation of the Spanish delegation's statement, expressing a

---

[286] Kantala, Timo. Deputy Director General at the Political Department, Finnish MFA. The OSCE's challenges in conflict prevention and peace-building. panel discussion at *OSCE 40 Years– cooperating with civil society for peace*. Laajan Turvallisuuden Verkosto (Wider Security Network). December 10, 2015.

[287] Swiss Delegation: Informal open-ended group of friends of the chair on peacekeeping – 2nd meeting on Friday, February 14, 2003: Agenda point 3. Workshop on peacekeeping April 4, 2003. February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/130/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[288] Spanish Delegation: Speaking notes by the Spanish Delegation at the second meeting of the informal open-ended group of friends of the chair on the OSCE role in the field of peacekeeping operations. February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/132/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

commitment to a specific brand of OSCE conflict resolution, as well as prioritizing inclusion of alternative baskets in PKO's, is also supported by the Spanish CiO in 2007 and their support of the HLPG.[289]

The Austrian Delegation's interest in a cross-dimensional or multidimensional approach to peacekeeping aligned itself with the Spanish delegations comments during the month of February. The Austrians expressed confidence in how such a multidimensional conflict management strategy could transform traditional, static peacekeeping into peace consolidation, giving the OSCE comparative advantage and fulfilling the visions of Paris, Helsinki, and Budapest.[290] The sentiment that seemed to immediately arise was against the initial suppositions of the Russian Federation statement the year before, which had proposed that the dimensions of peacekeeping be distinctly divided and focused in the FSC.[291] While the interest of reassessing the first PKO mandate seemed to be an affront to institutionally establish norms, political will began to consolidate against such proposals, exhibiting the strength norms had through reassertion.

Though there was clear support for the established norms and structural interconnectedness in OSCE conflict mediation, the Russian delegation was not finished testing their salience. Representatives from the Russian Federation continued to openly assert their priorities, putting a stake in the ground that Russian interest lay in the first dimension.[292] The longer political discussion of Russian power and preoccupation with international status suggests that the early 2000's was a period of re-solidification of Russian identity within Russian domestic politics, similar to growing influence of hardline factions in 1993. Especially after how certain corners of the Russian elite perceived the OSCE bullying its way into Chechnya and forcing the human dimension on them, there was

---

[289] Spanish Chairman-in-Office: Statement Delivered by the Chairperson of the Permanent Council on the Chairman-in-Office's Directive No. 9 for the OSCE HLPG at the 659th Meeting of the Permanent Council. OSCE +.

[290] Austrian Delegation: OSCE Peacekeeping, Second meeting of the group of friends of the chair on the OSCE role in the field of peacekeeping, February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/155/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[291] Russian Federation Delegation: Guidelines for the OSCE Peacekeeping Operations and Formation/Functioning of its Peacekeeping Forces (RF). OSCE Restricted.

[292] Russian Federation Delegation: Statement by Mr. Vladislav L. Chernov. Head of the Delegation of the Russian Federation at the Vienna Talks on Military Security and Arms Control, at the Meeting of Working Group B of the Forum for Security Co-Operation. February 26, 2003. Original Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/43/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

the feeling that Russian great power status had been violated.[293] Statements surrounding the OSCE PKO discussion give hints that Russia once again felt secure in the political-military dimension after the chaos of the early 1990's. Basket I was Russia's claim to great power status, as well as legitimacy in a Russian centered South Caucasus RSC.[294] The fact that political military supremacy was rhetorically asserted as a primary interest of Russia in the OSCE speaks to a longer narrative of a privileged position due to material strength. Actors such as the US also utilized this narrative, further highlighting some actors interest in a return of the geopolitical story discussed earlier.

The debate continued in the summer of 2003, when the Dutch CiO reasserted their interest in the debate by reissuing their own Food-for-Thought Paper in June. This paper restated the various PKO options available to the OSCE, but placed additional emphasis on police operations as an evolving tool for OSCE led post-conflict rehabilitation.[295] This institutional policy analysis paper was followed up by a commentary from the Russian Delegation, who again reasserted the need for a new command and control structure for a PKO, seemingly disregarding the wider, inter-dimensional discussion that was taking place.[296] Interestingly enough, the police operations found traction and are a critical piece of OSCE involvement in an evolving PKO discussion today for Ukraine.[297]

One month later the CPC circulated a paper on the capabilities of the OSCE to deploy and run a PKO. This perspective is interesting within the context of the FSC debate because it represents the theoretically impartial perspective of the institution and an internal perception on their own ability to fulfill the 1992 mandate. The majority of emphasis in the CPC paper focused on the political process rather than the post-agreement implementation stage. The points raised by the CPC emphasized the political framework of any OSCE PKO, focusing on the need to agree upon a single option for an OSCE PKO prior to

---

[293] Smith, Hanna (2014): *Russian Greatpowerness: Foreign Policy, the Two Chechen Wars and International Organizations.* Department of World politics, University of Helsinki. Helsinki, Finland. 181.
[294] Godzimirski, Jakub M. 2009, 134.
[295] Chairman in Office: Food-for-Thought-Paper, Potential options for OSCE activities in the field of Peacekeeping Operations. June 10, 2003. Document Number: CIO.GAL/54/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.
[296] Russian Federation Delegation: June 18, 2003. Original Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/249/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.
[297] Kanerva, Ilkka. Finnish Member of Parliament, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Member. *Rauhaa turvaamaan Ukrainaan?* Panel discussion. Laajan Turvallisuuden Verkosto (Wider Security Network). April 17, 2018.

implementation. The CPC understood the deadlock that occurred from 1995-1997 over the four options presented by the HLPG and saw this as one issue which diminished political will surrounding OSCE mediation of NK from 1997-2001. During the political discussion within the FSC, there was also a comment that the capacity of the CPC and OSCE to facilitate a PKO was not sufficient. This perception was addressed by the CPC, which commented on the creation of new structures such as the OPU and Rapid Expert Assistance and Co-Operation Team (REACT), used to quickly fill OSCE missions as conflict arose. At the time, these structures were in the process of developing so as to address structural issues that still existed within OSCE conflict management, explicitly an institutional inability to fully staff missions in a short period of time.[298] Irrespective, the CPC could still theoretically work to facilitate a PKO. Most significantly, there was also commentary that the OSCE should shift from single-application peacekeeping plans, to multi-application so that any PKO planning, which had been a focus of over a decade's worth of work by 2003, could be reused. This included a recommendation to expand the mandate of the HLPG to focus on other conflicts outside of NK.[299] The ability to reapply such planning to other conflict scenarios would increase the impact, ability, and flexibility of the OSCE for future operations. While the role of the OPU is highlighted in this analysis, the paper nonetheless concluded that the OSCE currently did not have the capacity to implement a PKO, but did have the ability to cooperate with other international organizations.

The CPC OPU paper is a highly telling document, as it gave an institutional push to the FSC political debate occurring in the summer of 2003. It reasserted the norms and intent of institution leadership for maintaining the OSCE as a conflict management body on the cutting edge of peacekeeping, with additional hope to continue expanding the mandate of 1992. While the CPC and OPU understood that their work was contingent on political will, participating states were not the only actors who defended and reinforced institutional norms.

---

[298] Quickly staffing missions was a primary inability of the CSCE in the Yugoslav conflict, disallowing some CSCE mission in the region to reach full strength before their mandate ended. For a more detailed conversation, see: Meier 2015, 31-33.

[299] Operations Planning Unit: Food-for-Thought-Paper: Current OSCE capabilities for deploying and running Peacekeeping Operations (PKOs). July 8, 2003. Document Number: SEC.GAL/81/03/REV.1. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

These potential nuances of the institutions ability to advocate for specific mediation courses are not always apparent. Authors such as Meier utilized the same documents, but interpreted them differently, possibly due to an undervaluation of OSCE institutional evolution. Meier presents the CPC OPU document presented above, commenting on the ability for the OSCE to implement one of the four PKO options presented by the HLPG.[300] Meier interprets the document stating:

> The documents conclude that the OSCE has neither the experience nor the operational capacity to deploy armed PKOs of the blue helmet type. Should the participating States decide to field armed PKOs, substantial and costly enhancement of the Secretariat's operational capacity would be needed. Or – as a second possibility – so-called turnkey operations could be envisaged. Participating States or other organizations would have to provide the OSCE with fully formed and trained units that are interoperable as well as operationally and logistically self-sustaining.[301]

Meier neglects much of the analysis presented in this paper, which focused on the OPU's references to the CPC's willingness to: further consolidate their power for future PKO planning, possibly make any NK PKO planning structurally reusable, and assert that various organs were already moving in that direction. Though Meier presents a highly valuable analysis (and highly influential to the study being written here), due to the lack of HLPG and CPC documents from the 1990's in Meier's analysis, documents are interpreted differently.

Meier also raises a very controversial argument with her interpretation of documents associated with this FSC debate. She asserts that:

> Western countries, in particular, repeatedly questioned the added value of OSCE engagement in peacekeeping. Instead of duplicating structures which already exist elsewhere, the OSCE would be better advised to build on its well-known expertise in early warning and conflict prevention. Furthermore, the financial implications of potential OSCE engagement in peacekeeping were repeatedly underlined. Considering the fact that the Organization lacks the necessary planning capacity as well as an appropriate logistical support system, substantial financial investment would be required to enable the Secretariat to deploy and operate military PKOs. [302]

Meier quotes one archival document emanating from the Italian delegation, presenting a statement on behalf of the EU, to support this claim, as well as a US and then Finnish

---

[300] Operations Planning Unit: Food-for-Thought-Paper: Current OSCE capabilities for deploying and running Peacekeeping Operations (PKOs). OSCE Restricted.
[301] Meier 2015, 27.
[302] Ibid., 29-30.

statement. The US statement is not surprising, but the conclusion Meier draws from the Italian and Finnish documents, interpreting them as the interests of all 'Western countries', echoes CSCE analysis dependent on block politics of the Cold War. The debate presented above highlights the variety of opinions within 'the West' as well as a general positive attitude towards an OSCE PKO. As this longer analysis has shown, though member states such as Finland may have brought up issues such as funding, that did not necessarily imply that they were against armed OSCE PKOs. If anything, by bringing the issue to a forum, it shows a form of leadership needed to begin conversation on tough issues so that a PKO in its intended, 1995 form could be realized. This reading was supported by both Timo Kantala and Ilkka Kanerva in different panel discussions of Finland's role in Peacekeeping and the OSCE.[303] Thus, Meier neglects a deeper reading of strategic culture and simplifies the narratives specific actors wanted to write.

Following this seminal CPC/OPU paper, the Swedish Delegation brought up legal concerns with an OSCE PKO, all points that the US used in 1997. There concerns orbited around issues with the legality of a status of forces agreement (SOFA), terms of reference (ToR), memorandum of understanding (MoU), and rules of engagement (RoE).[304] These were all issues that killed the PKO debate in 1995-1997. With a period of moderate political will and the commentary from the CPC in 2002-2003, it seemed that participating states were prepared to try once again to discuss the contentious issues that brought conversation to a halt five years before (and continue to be issues to this day). The SOFA debate is also a piece Meier discusses, but she again interprets it as a reason 'Western states' were against an OSCE PKO. She cites one archival document from the Finnish delegation to represent the entirety of 'Western opinion'. While there were concerns regarding the SOFA, as shown here, when read in a longer PKO narrative, it was a necessary concern that needed to be addressed so as to achieve consensus. Similar to how the Swiss delegation's statements were interpreted to offered reflective questions in promoting debate, Sweden's and Finland's statements can also be understood in this frame. With their memory of the competition over mediation in the 1990's and the limited progress made at Key West in 2001, Sweden and Finland may have also looked to foster

[303] Kanerva, Ilkka. Finnish Member of Parliament, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Member. Rauhaa turvaamaan Ukrainaan?; Kantala, Timo. Deputy Director General at the Political Department, Finnish MFA. The OSCE's challenges in conflict prevention and peace-building.

[304] Swedish Delegation: Working Paper for the FSC Informal, Open Ended Working Group on PK. July 9, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/333/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

discussion in anticipation of a window of opportunity. Along with the hope seen in HLPG Directive Seven issued in 2003 (page 76-79), these statements can also be read as containing hope of finding common ground with Russia on a PKO so as not to descend back to the instability that hampered mediation prior to 1994. Controversially, Meier reads these documents as dissenting opinions against a PKO, overlooking Finland's role as a bridge, Sweden's commitment the norms of preventative diplomacy, as well as the longer narrative of leadership they both wrote in regards to NK mediation and PKO facilitation.

The Swedes also mentioned the HLPG in their working paper, but only in the capacity that they would support the FSC in composing recommendations for the 2003 Maastricht Ministerial Council.[305] It was clear in member state documents that there was not the political will needed to further expand the HLPG mandate at the time. As is seen in the HLPG discussion, the OSCE organ was fighting just to reinvigorate participating states will to fund HLPG monitoring missions to the region. The request of the Swedish delegation for the expertise of the HLPG is interesting because it can be read as a way to intertwine old structures with new. By involving the HLPG in the FSC review, the Swedish delegation diplomatically advocated for the co-evolution of OSCE mediation structures and political forums even though the HLPG was a contentious issue in the command and control debate. The HLPG eventually regained regional access in 2005. Though Sweden may have helped reincorporate Russia into the discussion by raising SOFA issues, their commitment to the HLPG can be interpreted as a reassertion of their commitment to the original PKO mandate regarding command and control.

The year of debate in the FSC was concluded with the US Chair's summary, commenting on the work of all FSC Chef de Files from January to November of 2003 in preparation for Maastricht in December. While the statement was generally impartial, the concluding remarks focus on the lack of consensus achieved over the year and highlighted that issues remained with the proposed PKO options. Their positive point was to recognize that there were now more informed options on the table.[306] While political will may not have been that of 1990-1994 during the European euphoria, the limited political will was

[305] Swedish Delegation: Working Paper for the FSC Informal, Open Ended Working Group on PK: Evaluation of Option A, armed Peacekeeping. September 30, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/333/03/ Rev.4. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

[306] American Delegation: Report of the Chairmanship (US Chairmanship) of the FSC on the OSCE Role in the Field of Peacekeeping Operations. November 25, 2003. Document Number: FSC.GAL/152/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

significant in doing exactly what the American Delegation mentioned. The FSC debate created more informed options and resurrected the dialog for the ministers to once again put a PKO on the agenda in Maastricht. This disallowed established norms to wither into nothingness and reaffirmed the OSCE's potential to support regional security, continuing to give confidence to Armenia and Azerbaijan that the OSCE could facilitate a PKO if a political peace was achieved. It should be noted that as of today, it is still the perspective of the OSCE Minsk group that an OSCE PKO will be responsible for post-conflict resolution after any political agreement. Due to a 'gentleman's agreement,' no Minsk Group Co-Chair will donate peacekeepers to an OSCE PKO, inherently acknowledging that an armed PKO is still on the table.[307]

The debate of 2002-2003 in the FSC offers a unique reflection on Russia's interpretations of OSCE institutionalization. The FSC debate outlined here offers an initial instance where the impact of the Russian assertion that the OSCE had negatively institutionalized to support a particular narrative of security (first dimension) was seen. Russian interests in debating command and control as well as Basket I issues was seemingly channeled into a discussion resulting in the reaffirmation of established norms. While the Russian narrative of security associated with Basket I, though validated and engaged by Swiss, Finnish, and Swedish statements, was also countered by reaffirmation of support for inter-basket conflict management. Small states reaffirmed the norms of Paris and Budapest, attempting to incorporate Russia, albeit still on the terms of Paris 1990. Consequently, the debate over inter-basket conflict management continued to grow after 2004, remaining a primary issue today. President Putin's 2007 speech and Ambassador Borodavkin's comments alluded to how entire baskets became securitized as part of diverging narratives of European security. Thus, helping explain why OSCE initiatives in the region become more securitized, with the OSCE Mission in Georgia leaving after 2008 and the OSCE Offices in Baku and Yerevan closing in 2015 and 2017 respectively. Though these closures were not solely the result of Russian securitization of the OSCE in the region, the divergence of narratives and security values in the early 2000's played a key role. Specifically with regard to how other actors in the region came to understand the OSCE in the frame of who provided security for the South Caucasus RSC.

---

[307] Grono, Magdalena (2017): Looming Dangers One Year after Nagorno-Karabakh Escalation. *International Crisis Group*. May 31, 2017. https://www.crisisgroup.org/europe-central-asia/caucasus/nagorno-karabakh-azerbaijan/looming-dangers-one-year-after-nagorno-karabakh-escalation. (accessed May 30, 2017).

5 Conclusion

"The historic reconstruction of the development of the last twenty five years should be left to historians, although the outcome of this reconstruction may have effects on the further life of contemporary narratives."

Andrei Zagorski 2017 [308]

The story of institutional evolution in various CSCE/OSCE forums is critical in understanding how a multitude of ideas and narratives of European security were written in the 1990's. Specifically the discourse of NK mediation and PKO debate exhibit that the investigation of institutions is beneficial for understanding the impact of said ideas on post-Cold War security structures. This sub-strain is critical in understanding how certain ideas and parts of the institution became increasingly securitized alongside the diverging accounts of post-Cold War security. It is also critical in attempting to offer actors a deeper empathy for their negotiating partners.

As narratives recounting the origin of conflict after the Cold War diverged, even the semblance of cooperation that was achieved in the early 1990's changes meaning depending on who is writing history. In the words of Zagorski, "The debates over narratives should not be confused with the search for historic truth."[309] As such, the story offered here presents a particular vantage point in interpreting the conglomerate of narratives written through the CSCE/OSCE process of mediation and institutionalization surrounding NK. The CSCE/OSCE offers a specific repository for the security preferences of participating states and their statements and participation in debates reflect one discourse in the historiography of the past 25 years.

In adding to the wider discussion on security narratives that is currently underway in the OSCE research community, this thesis adds a few points to the debate. 1) When considering the construction of new European security structures in the 1990's, the institution (hear the CSCE/OSCE) is a necessary subject of investigation – actors' narratives were inherently influenced by institutionalization and hence, the frame in which debate occurred. 2) The ability for small states to reassert norms and pursue institutionalization in support of a perceived consensus security narrative is significant in understanding the way in which actors came to understand the CSCE/OSCE. Those that

[308] Zagorski 2017, 100.
[309] Ibid.

took leadership roles seemingly had more ability to shape institutionalization, if only through the reassertion of previous norms. 3) By being able to consider security within the frame of a longer process such as the CSCE, rather than simply the liminal historic moment of ambiguity that defined the 1990's, participating states were able to anchor there various narratives of security to an existing entity. This contemplation on memory asked highly relevant questions to how security identities are formed as a result of strategic culture as well as interpretations of history and could be beneficial for future studies.

At the core of these conclusions is the role of small states. Discussed throughout this thesis, these actors effectively raised their voices in several OSCE forums to oppose, either subtly or directly, US and Russian unilateral attempts to direct institutional evolution and conflict management. Many states strayed from the idealist vision of European security established in 1990-1996, levitating towards NATO or entrenched RSC paradigms. Regardless, many were still willing to defend the spirit of Helsinki and the functionality of CSCE conflict management tools in preparation for new periods of high political will. That being said, the disagreement over which values should define European security was founded in differing historical interpretations of responsibility at the end of the Cold War, influencing how collective security was interpreted. Accordingly, this account asserts the significance an investigation of institutional evolution has for understanding a subset of post-Cold War security narratives.

The presentation of individual strategic cultures argued that new security interests and narratives were influenced by memory politics. Former N+N states' positive memory of the latitude the CSCE offered them for personal security interests in a stricter block to block security paradigm of the Cold War. These memories helps explain the leadership role and responsibility such states took in CSCE/OSCE institutional evolution and conflict management. Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, and ever so momentarily Yugoslavia are included in this group.

The second loose grouping of interpretation consists of various former WP states. While having fond memories of the CSCE as a means for loosening the grip of the Brezhnev Doctrine, they also had clearly stated goals of NATO membership. Their memory of the communist past was occasionally written as a dominant discourse of occupation. This is in opposition to a fluid and nuanced history where cooperation and collaboration was compared to complicity. This selective memory was reflected in the emerging 'back to

Europe' description that arose in opposition to 'common European home' narrative and a collective memory arguably achieved at the 1990 CSCE Paris summit. As the 1990's continued, a collective security discourse with Russia became momentarily incompatible with the emerging memory politics for many of these post-communist states. Though NATO increasingly became the former WP countries' definition for European security, their temporal dedication to and leadership in the CSCE/OSCE allowed for significant institutional structures to be erected in preparation for new periods of high political will. Poland, Czechoslovakia/Czechia, and Hungary are part of this story.

Small states that were previously part of the NATO community also showed an interest and ability to sustain OSCE norms in periods of low political will. Though still sustaining their identity within the NATO security community, they offered support via leadership in the institutionalization process to sustain the idea of Europe agreed upon in Paris, Budapest, and Lisbon. The Netherlands and Denmark are in this group.

Another significant meditation in this period was the meaning of Russia and how to treat the NIS. The strategic culture of Armenia and Azerbaijan alongside Russia's (Soviet Union's) part in supporting the growth of these nation-states is a significant consideration. This is particularly relevant when looking at how post-Soviet Armenia and Azerbaijan struggled with writing new security stories. As the collapse of the USSR created a momentary power vacuum in the South Caucasus, both countries had to consider what their interest in a larger European idea was, as well as their ability to sustain domestic political legitimacy. The OSCE as a new European security idea conflicted with the historic perception of Russia and how security was to be achieved. While human rights and other development incentives may have been accepted by Armenia and Azerbaijan, when read through the respective outlooks of the political elite in the early 1990's, the instability of each security culture raises questions regarding actual perceptions of their RSC. Participation in the CSCE was possibly just another tool to use as leverage in sustaining newly found sovereignty. That being said, as conservative and military factions regained footing in domestic Russian politics, the work of the OSCE in the region became further securitized. This subsequently limited Azerbaijan's and Armenia's perceptions of the OSCE as a substantial security provider. Due to lingering ideas of domestic and international legitimacy, historically rooted in security relations with Russia, OSCE mediation and intervention in a South Caucasus RSC became a growing issue of

securitization. Thus, over the course of the 1990's in the South Caucasus, the idea of Europe remained a myth insomuch as solidifying sovereignty and defining security was a prerequisite to the debates continental Europe was having.

The brief and limited array of narratives incorporated into this story do offer the conclusion that as of 2004, interest remained for a multi-application PKO plan. This meaning a PKO plan that could be applied to areas other than NK. While consensus could not be found on many issues such as SOFA, command and control, financing, etc., it did allow for the PKO debate to continue to progress. As the 2002-2003 FSC debate hinted at, though hard peacekeeping measures needed a special historic moment like the early 1990's to gain consensus, police operations were a PKO form that allowed the debate to continue post 2004 in a more amicable direction.

Further Study

These subsets of the larger NK mediation story are by no means comprehensive. Many of the above conclusions were only investigated in reference to the NK conflict and mediation. For example, a deeper investigation of the CiO responsibility and action could possibly add additional support and nuance to the argumentation of small states taking sustained responsibility in defending the norms of the 1990's, even though some looked to NATO for comprehensive security guaranties. The Polish CiO the year before their NATO ascension would be an interesting investigation, as well as the Czechoslovak, Hungarian, and Romanian CiOs in 1992, 1995, and 2001 respectively. This would also help look at the question of why the CiO mandate was restricted in 2002 after given greater leeway in 1994. On the other hand, the growing critical view of the first dimension by the Russian Federation embodied larger disagreements about how OSCE institutionalization had progressed. This may have influenced how the CiO position we resubordinated to strict consensus after Porto. These additional flows would undoubtedly offer new interpretive shades of memory and strategic culture, nuancing the interpretation of documents in the story offered here.

Further investigation into wider military modernization and force structure discussions remains an issue for further study. For example, there are various documents in the OSCE archive about force modernization from the Russian delegation as they attempt to reorganize the Soviet military. This most likely had an impact on Russia's ability to produce PKOs, as well as their ability to coherently direct a command and control structure.

An analysis of the way in which these projects were presented to the OSCE, as well as a parallel investigation into how the Russian military was actually modernizing would be another interesting discourse for understanding the Russian narrative and self-perception as a security provider. It may also shed light on how they wanted to present that image to Europe in the context of diverging narratives and perceived securitization, penetration, and overlay in the post-Soviet Space.

In a similar vein, the SOFA, use of force, and command and control debates would be useful to track up to the current day. Recently, there has been talk within the UN regarding the legitimate use of force in PKO operations, giving UN PKOs the ability to take offensive action to enforce peace.[310] This debate looks very similar to the form of peace Russia looked to enforce following the collapse of the Soviet Union in various regions. This then asks the reflective question: if peace enforcement is being considered as a legitimate proposal for contemporary UN PKOs, why was it interpreted as illegitimate when Russia utilized them in the 1990's? Of course there are differences between the UN and Russia in regards to political partiality, but it does raise questions for an interesting critique of the historical debates of CSCE/OSCE peacekeeping narratives and interpretations.

As this thesis has shown, the evolution of one OSCE forum is inherently dependent on an understanding of the institution as a whole, as well as shifting memories, strategic culture, and the security identities of states involved in the discussion of norms. Therefore, any investigation into the OSCE from the perspective of HI and institutional evolution in the 1990's is bound to have a commentary on the NK mediation process. Recognizing Nagorno-Karabakh as one of the OSCE's foundational attempts and hence memories to take on conflict mediation is central to understanding the OSCE of today. Such a test was central to the importance of a young institution in the post-Cold War world and had institutional, structural, and normative implications for an understanding of post-Cold War Europe, as well as collective security memory politics.

---

[310] United Nations Security Council Comprehensive Review on the Whole Question of Peacekeeping Operations in All Their Aspects. 17 June, 2015. Document Number: A/70/95 – S/2015/446. UN-ODS. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2015/446. (accessed April 28, 2018); Alberto dos Santos Cruz, Carlos (2017): *Improving Security of United nations Peacekeepers: We Need to Change the Way We are Doing Business.* UN Department of Peacekeeping, New York, USA. https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/improving_security_of_united_nations_peacekeepers_report.pdf. (accessed April 27, 2018).

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Annual Report 1993 on CSCE Activities, CSCE Secretary General. Office of the Secretary General. Vienna, Austria. OSCE Open. OSCE Internet Archive - Document Library (OSCE-DL). https://www.osce.org/secretariat/14581. (accessed June 12, 2017).

Armenian Delegation: Statement on Possible OSCE Role in Peacekeeping Delivered by Ambassador J. Tabibian at the Forum for Security Cooperation. October 7, 2002. Document Number: *FSC.DEL/541/02.* OSCE Restricted. OSCE Archive - OSCE Documentation Center in Prague (DCiP). Prague, Czech Republic.

Austrian Delegation: OSCE Peacekeeping, Second meeting of the group of friends of the chair on the OSCE role in the field of peacekeeping, February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/155/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Budapest Document 1994: Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era. Budapest, Hungary. December 5-6, 1994. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL https://www.osce.org/mc/39554. (accessed July 5, 2017)

Chairman in Office: Food-for-Thought-Paper, Potential options for OSCE activities in the field of Peacekeeping Operations. June 10, 2003. Document Number: CIO.GAL/54/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Charter of Paris for a New Europe. Paris, France November 19-20, 1990. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/39516. (accessed August 1, 2017).

CSCE and the New Europe – Our Security is Indivisible: Decisions of the Rome Council Meeting. Rome, Italy, November 30- December 1, 1993. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40401. (accessed June 23, 2018)

CSCE Helsinki Document 1992: The Challenges of Change. Helsinki, Finland. July 9-10, 1992. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/39530. (accessed June 29, 2017).

Denmark Chairman-in-Office: Chairman-in-Office Directive No 5 to the OSCE High Level Planning Group. March 13, 1997. Document Number: REF.CIO/10/97. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE. October 3, 1991. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/14310. (accessed May 3, 2018).

Eleventh Meeting of the Ministerial Council 1 and 2 December 2003, Final Document. Maastricht, Netherlands. December 1-2, 2003. Document Number: MC.DOC/1/03. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL https://www.osce.org/mc/40533. (accessed July 20, 2017).

Emergency Preliminary Meetings of the Minsk Group of the CSCE. Second Session, Third Day. Villa Madama, Rome, Italy. June 17, 1992. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Finland Chairman-in-Office: Directive 10 of the OSCE Chairmanship-in-Office for the HLPG. January 30, 2008.Document Number: CIO.GAL/24/08. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

FSC: Chair's Perception on terms of Chef de files. February 5, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/28/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

High Level Planning Group: Mission Statement for a Possible Peacekeeping Mission to the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. June 27, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/23/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

HLPG Staff List. September 20, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/72/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Hungary Chairman-in-Office: High Level Planning Group, Chairman-in-Office Directive No. 2. June 20, 1995. Document Number: REF.CIO/19/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Lisbon Summit: Lisbon Document 1996. December 3, 1996. Document Number: DOC.S/1/96. OSCE Open. https://www.osce.org/mc/39539. (accessed June 5, 2017)

Netherlands Chairman-in-Office: Directive Number 7 for the OSCE HLPG. OSCE. July 18, 2003. Document Number: CIO.GAL/76/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Operations Planning Unit: Food-for-Thought-Paper: Current OSCE capabilities for deploying and running Peacekeeping Operations (PKOs). July 8, 2003. Document Number: SEC.GAL/81/03/REV.1. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

OSCE Permanent Council: Decision No. 257. 186th Plenary Meeting, PC Journal No. 186, Agenda item 5. October 1, 1998. Document Number: PC.DEC/257. OSCE Open. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

OSCE Permanent Council: Decision No. 364 Strengthening of OSCE Operational Capacities (React, Operation Centre, Restructuring of the OSCE Secretariat). 289th Plenary Meeting. PC Journal No. 289, Agenda item 2. June 29, 2000. Document Number: PC.DEC/364. OSCE Open. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

OSCE Secretariat's Conflict Prevention Centre, Operations Service (CPC/OS): OSCE Mechanisms & Procedures: Summary/ Compendium. Vienna, Austria. September 14, 2011. Document Number: SEC.GAL/132/11. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/cpc/34427. (accessed May 25, 2017).

Peaceful Settlement of Disputes: report of the CSCE meeting of experts on peaceful settlement of disputes. Valletta, Malta. February 8, 1991. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/secretariat/30115. (accessed August 7, 2017).

Poland Chairman-in-Office: Chairman-in-Office Directive No. 6 to the OSCE HLPG. March 18, 1998. Document Number: CIO.GAL/11/98. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Porto Ministerial Declaration, Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council. Porto, Portugal. December 6-7, 2002. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40521. (accessed August 1, 2017).

Prague Document on Further Development of CSCE Institutions and Structures; Declaration on Non-Proliferation and Arms Transfers. Second Meeting of the Council; Summary of Conclusions. Prague, Czechoslovakia, January 30-31, 1992. Document Number: 2PRAG92.e. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL https://www.osce.org/mc/40270. (accessed June 35, 2017).

Report by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the Conflict dealt with by the Minsk Conference in distributed at the request of the Chairman-in-Office. November 9, 1995. Document Number: REF.SEC/334/95. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Russian Federation Delegation: Guidelines for the OSCE Peacekeeping Operations and Formation/Functioning of its Peacekeeping Forces (RF). July 17, 2002. Original: Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/449/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Russian Federation Delegation: Statement by Mr. Andrei Vorobiev, Member of the Delegation of the Russian Federation at the Vienna Talks on Military Security and Arms Control, at the Plenary Meeting of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-Operation. July 17, 2002. Original: Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/448/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Russian Federation Delegation: Statement by Mr. Vladislav L. Chernov. Head of the Delegation of the Russian Federation at the Vienna Talks on Military Security and Arms Control, at the Meeting of Working Group B of the Forum for Security Co-Operation. February 26, 2003. Original Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/43/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Russian Federation Delegation: June 18, 2003. Original Russian. Document Number: FSC.DEL/249/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Slovenia Chairman-in-Office: Chairmanship's Directive Number 8 for the OSCE HLPG. June 22, 2005. Document Number: CIO.GAL/98/05. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Spanish Chairman-in-Office: Statement Delivered by the Chairperson of the Permanent Council on the Chairman-in-Office's Directive No. 9 for the OSCE HLPG at the 659th Meeting of the Permanent Council. March 29, 2007. Document Number: CIO/GAL/49/07. OSCE +. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Spanish Delegation: Speaking notes by the Spanish Delegation at the second meeting of the informal open-ended group of friends of the chair on the OSCE role in the field of peacekeeping operations. February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/132/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Swiss Delegation: Informal open-ended group of friends of the chair on peacekeeping – 2nd meeting on Friday, February 14, 2003: Agenda point 3. Workshop on peacekeeping April 4, 2003. February 14, 2003. Document Number: PC.DEL/130/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Swedish Delegation: Working Paper for the FSC Informal, Open Ended Working Group on PK: Evaluation of Option A, armed Peacekeeping. September 30, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/333/03/ Rev.4. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Swedish Delegation: Working Paper for the FSC Informal, Open Ended Working Group on PK. July 9, 2003. Document Number: FSC.DEL/333/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Swiss Delegation: Guidelines for the OSCE Peacekeeping Operations and Formation/Functioning of its Peacekeeping Forces (Food-for-Thought-Paper by the Russian Delegation; FSC.DEL/449/02 17 July 2002). October 2, 2002. Document Number: FSC.DEL/535/02. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Switzerland Chairman-in-Office: High Level Planning Group, Chairman-in-Office Directive Number 4. February 23, 1996. Document Number: REF.CIO/15/96. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Switzerland Chairman-in-Office: The Security Model Discussion 1995-1996: Report of the chairman-in-Office to the Lisbon Summit. November 30, 1996. Lisbon, Portugal. Document Number: LS96EW02. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40928. (accessed May 25, 2017).

The Challenges of Change. CSCE Helsinki Document 1992. CSCE Summit, 9-10 July 1992. Helsinki, Finland. OSCE Open. OSCE Internet Archive - Document Library (OSCE-DL). https://www.osce.org/mc/39530. (accessed June 10, 2017).

Third Meeting of the Council: Summary of Conclusions, Decision on Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. Stockholm, Sweden. December 14-15, 1992. Document Number: 3STOCK92.e. OSCE Open. OSCE-DL. https://www.osce.org/mc/40342. (accessed June 24, 2017).

United Nations Security Council Comprehensive Review on the Whole Question of Peacekeeping Operations in All Their Aspects. 17 June, 2015. Document Number: A/70/95 – S/2015/446. UN-ODS. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2015/446. (accessed April 28, 2018).

United Nations Security Council Resolution 822. April 30, 1993. Document Number: S/RES/822. United Nations Official Document System (UN-ODS) https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/247/71/IMG/N9324771.pdf?OpenElement. (accessed June 14, 2017).

United Nations Security Council Resolution 853. July 29 1993. Document Number: S/RES/853. United Nations Official Document System (UN-ODS) https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/428/34/IMG/N9342834.pdf?OpenElement. (accessed June 14, 2017.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 874. October 14, 1993. Document Number: S/RES/874. UN-ODS https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N93/557/41/PDF/N9355741.pdf?OpenElement. (accessed June 14, 2017)

USOSCE: Memorandum to HLPG from USOSCE. June 12, 1996. Document Number: REF.PC/361/96. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

USOSCE: Report of the Chairmanship (US Chairmanship) of the FSC on the OSCE Role in the Field of Peacekeeping Operations. November 25, 2003. Document Number: FSC.GAL/152/03. OSCE Restricted. DCiP. Prague, Czech Republic.

Practitioner's Accounts and Analysis

Af Ugglas, Margaretha (1994): Conditions for Successful Preventive Diplomacy. In: Carlsson, Staffan (ed.) *The Challenges of Preventative Diplomacy: The Experience of the CSCE*. Norstedts Tryckeri AB, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm. 11-33.

Bloed, Arie (2014): OSCE Principles: Which Principles? *Security and Human Rights*. Vol. 25. 210-220.

Borodavkin, Alexey (2005): "Russia, OSCE Should Shed 'Mentors' and 'Problem Children' Posture." Interviewed by the Finnish Committee for European Security– STETE. *OSCE Review*. Vol. 13, No. 1. 6-7

Freeman, John (1992): *Security and the CSCE Process: The Stockholm Conference and Beyond*. Royal United Service Institute. Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD. London, UK

Gyarmati, Istvan (1996): The Hungarian Chairmanship and the Chechnya Conflict. *OSCE Yearbook*. Vol. 1. 175-18.

Hakala, Terhi (1998): The OSCE Minsk Process: A Balance after Five Years. *Helsinki Monitor*. Vol 9, Is 5. Netherlands Helsinki Committee. 5-14.

Halonen, Tarja (1997): *Finland as a Mediator in the Karabakh Conflict*. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Publications of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Helsinki, Finland.

Hartutunian, Ruben (2010): The Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict: Moving from Power Brokerage to Relationship Restructuring. *International Negotiation: A Journal of Theory and Practice*. Vol 5. No1. 57-80.

Höynck, Wilhelm (1994): CSCE Missions in the Field as an Interment of Preventative Diplomacy – Their Origin and Development. In: Carlsson, Staffan (ed.) *The Challenges of Preventative Diplomacy: The Experience of the CSCE*. Norstedts Tryckeri AB, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm. 55-73.

Iloniemi, Jaakko (2006): *Finland's Goals in the CSCE*. Suomen Ulkominiseriö. file:///C:/Users/breynold/Downloads/Etyk_eng.pdf. (accessed July 13, 2017).

Kanerva, Ilkka. Finnish Member of Parliament, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Member. *Rauhaa turvaamaan Ukrainaan?* Panel discussion. Laajan Turvallisuuden Verkosto (Wider Security Network). April 17, 2018.

Kantala, Timo. Deputy Director General at the Political Department, Finnish MFA. The OSCE's challenges in conflict prevention and peace-building. Panel discussion at *OSCE 40 Years–cooperating with civil society for peace*. Laajan Turvallisuuden Verkosto (Wider Security Network). December 10, 2015.

Kasprzyk, Andrzej and Mient-Jan Faber (2003): How Should the OSCE Deal With the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict? *Helsinki Monitor*, Vol. 14, Is. 1. Netherlands Helsinki Committee. 2-3.

Kemp, Walter (2009): The OSCE Chairmanship: Captain or Figurehead? *Security and Human Rights.* No. 9. 9-12

Kozyrev, Andrei V. (1992): Russia and Human Rights. *Slavic Review.* Vol. 51, No. 2. 287-293

Maresca, John J. (1985): *To Helsinki: The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 1973-1975.* Duke University Press.

Maresca, John J. (1996): Lost Opportunities in Negotiating the Conflict over Nagorno Karabakh. *International Negotiation*. Vol. 1, Is. 3. 471-499.

Maresca, John J. (2015): *Helsinki Revisited: A Key U.S. Negotiator's Memoirs on the Development of the CSCE into the OSCE*. Ibidem, verlag. Stuttgart, Germany.

McDonagh, Philip (1987): The Strengthening of Security in Europe: The Stockholm Conference, 1984-86. *Irish Studies in International Affairs.* Vol. 2, No. 3. 79-97

Milanova, Nadia Kirilova (2002): *The Conflict Over Nagorno-Karabakh 1992-2002: Ten Years of Missed Conflict Resolution Opportunities.* The University of Exeter, Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Politics. Exeter, UK.

Möttölä, Kari (1997): The OSCE: Institutional and Functional Developments in an Evolving European Security Order. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 1-35.

Putin, Vladimir (2007): Выступление и дискуссия на Мюнхенской конференции по вопросам политики безопасности – Speech and discussion at the Munich Security Conference. *президент России – President of Russia*. http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24034. (accessed April 25, 2018).

Tomuschat, Christian (2014): What is the OSCE Court of Conciliation and Arbitration? Interviewed by OSCE. August 22, 2014. https://www.osce.org/cca/122915. (accessed June 15, 2017).

Vilén, Heikki (1997): ETYJ:n kriisinhallintamekanismit ja mahdollisuudet yhteistyöhön kriisien toimijoiden kanssa. In: *Rauhanturvaamisen muuttuvat kasvot: oppeja tulevaisuudelle.* Puolustusministeriön Julkaisuja. Helsinki, Finland. NRO 1/1997. 103-124.

Vilén, Heikki and Karie, Mike (1995): Preparations of a Peace-keeping Mission for the Na-gorono-Karahakh Conflict by the OSCE's High Level Planning Group (HLPG). *Journal of International Peacekeeping.* Vol. 2, Is. 5. 106-109.

Zagorski, Andrei (1991): New European Unity: The End of the CSCE? *Paradigms*. Vol. 5, Is. 1. 76-88

Zagorski, Andrei (1992): New Institutions and Structures of the CSCE: Adjusting to the New Europe. *Paradigms*. Vol. 6, Is. 2. 12-25.

Western Journalists

De Waal, Thomas (2010): Remaking the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Process. *Survival*, August-September 2010. Vol 52. No 4. 159-176.

De Waal, Thomas (2013): *Black Garden*. New York University Press. New York

Fuller, Elizabeth (1994): *Russian Strategy in the Transcaucasus since the Demise of the USSR.* Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studie. Cologne, Germany.

Mihalka, Michael (1996): A Marriage of Convenience: The OSCE and Russia in Nagorny-Karabakh and Chechnya. *Helsinki Monitor*. Vol. 7, No. 13. 16-32.

Mihalka, Michael (1996): Nagorno-Karabakh and Russian Peacekeeping: Prospects for a Second Dayton. *International Peacekeeping.* Vol. 3, No. 3. Autumn 1996. 16-32.

Literature

Alberto dos Santos Cruz, Carlos (2017): *Improving Security of United nations Peacekeepers: We Need to Change the Way We are Doing Business.* UN Department of Peacekeeping, New York, USA. https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/improving_security_of_united_nations_peacekeepers_report.pdf. (accessed April 27, 2018).

Allison, Roy (1994): *Peacekeeping in the Soviet Successor* States. Chaillot Papers, No. 18. Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union.

Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Humphreys, Brendan (2010): *Winter Kept us Warm: Cold War Interactions Reconsidered*. Aleksanteri Cold War Series 1. Bookwell Oy. Jyväskylä, Finland.

Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Miklossy, Katalin (2011): *Reassessing Cold War Europe*. Routledge Press, New York

Bentley, Michael (1999): *Modern Historiography: An Introduction.* Routledge Publishing. London UK.

Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) (2013): *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany.

Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) (1997): Conclusions and Perspectives. In: In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 511-518

Burci, Gianluca (1997): Division of Labour between the UN and the OSCE in Connection with Peace-keeping. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 289-315.

Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever (2003): *Regions and Power: The Structures of International Security*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.

Cox, Michael (2008): Who won the Cold War in Europe. In: Bozo *Europe and the End of the Cold War: A Reappraisal*. New York, USA: Routledge Publishing, 9-19.

Cubitt, Geoffrey (2007): *History and Memory*. Manchester University Press. Manchester, UK.

Davies, Lance (2015): Russian Institution Learning and Regional Peace Operations: The Case of Georgia and Moldova. *Camillas Jounral of International Relations.* May-August 2015 Issue.

Davies Lance (2017): Searching for Security in the South Caucasus: Russia and Western Regional Security Mechanisms, 2000-2016 *Cascade: Exploring the Security-Democracy Nexus in the Caucasus.* European Union Seventh Framework Programme.

Dehdashti, Rexane (1997): Nagorno-Karabakh: A Case-study of OSCE Conflict Settlement. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 459-479.

Demirtepe, Turgut and Laciner, Sedat (2004): Nationalism as an Instrument in a Socialist Foreign Policy: The Southern Azerbaijan Problem in Soviet-Iranian Relations. *The Review of International Affairs*. Vol. 3, No. 3. 443-457.

Eke, Steven (1999): Analysis: East-West relations must shift. *British Broadcasting Network.* November, 19 1999. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/528362.stm, (accessed October 29, 2016).

Felkay, Andrew (1997): *Out of Russian Orbit; Hungary Gravitates to the West*. Praeger Publishing. Santa Barbara, CA.

Fewster, Derek (2006): *Visions of Past Glory: Nationalism and the Construction of Early Finnish History*. Finnish Literature Society. Helsinki, Finland.

Fischer, Thomas (2009): *Neutral Power in the CSCE: The N+N States and the Making of the Helsinki Accords 1975*. Austrian Institute for International Affairs. Normos Publishing. Germany.

Franzosi, Roberto (2006): Historical Knowledge and Evidence. *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Gelb, Leslie (1993): Foreign Affairs; Yeltsin as Monroe. *New York Times*. March 7, 1993. http://www.nytimes.com/1993/03/07/opinion/foreign-affairs-yeltsin-as-monroe.html?mcubz=1. (accessed August 18, 2017).

Godzimirski, Jakub M. (2009): Russia and the OSCE: From High Expectations to Denial? In: Torjesen, Stina and Rowe, Elana Wilson (ed.) *The Multilateral Dimension in Russian Foreign Policy.* Routledge 2009. 121-141.

Greco, Ettore (1997): Third Party Peace-keeping and the Interaction between Russia and the OSCE in the CIS Area. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 267-289.

Grono, Magdalena (2017): Looming Dangers One Year after Nagorno-Karabakh Escalation. *International Crisis Group*. May 31, 2017. https://www.crisisgroup.org/europe-central-asia/caucasus/nagorno-karabakh-azerbaijan/looming-dangers-one-year-after-nagorno-karabakh-escalation. (accessed May 30, 2017).

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard and Kocka, Jürgen (2004): *Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems. Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*. Routledge, New York.

Hecht, Catherine (2016): Success after Stalemate? Persistence, Reiteration and Windows of Opportunity in Multilateral Negotiations. *Journal of International Organization Studies.* Vol 7. Is. 2. 23-38.

Iggers, George (1999): *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Wesleyan University Press. Middletown, CT. USA.

Imranli-Lowe, Kamala (2015): Reconstruction of the 'Armenian Homeland' Notion. *Middle Eastern Studies*. Vol. 51 No.4. 540-562.

Jires, Jan (2010): Czech Republic. In: In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 69-83

Johnston, Alastair Iain (1995): Thinking about Strategic Culture *International Security.* Vol. 19, No. 4. 32-64.

Karlasson, Klas-Goran (2010): The Use of History in the Third Wave of Europeanization. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 38-55

Kratochvíl, Petr and Věra Řiháčková (2015): Domestic political context since 1989: Russia as a dividing element in Czech society. In: Kucharczyk, Jacek and Mesežnikov, Grigorij *Diverging Voices, Converging Policies: The Visegrad States' Reactions to the Russia-Ukraine Conflict.* Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Warsaw.

Kuusisto, Rikka (2009): Comic Plots as Conflict Resolution Strategy. *European Journal of International Relations.* Is.15 No.4. 601-626.

Liechtenstein, Stephanie (2014): A Permanent Swiss Chairmanship for the OSCE – a Viable Suggestion? *Security and Human Rights Monitor.* July 28, 2014. https://www.shrmonitor.org/permanent-swiss-chairmanship-osce-viable-suggestion/. (accessed March 3, 2018).

Lindström, Mirva (2006): Towards a New Europe. In *Finland's Goals in the CSCE*. Suomen Ulkominiseriö. file:///C:/Users/breynold/Downloads/Etyk_eng.pdf. (accessed July 13, 2017).

Miklossy, Katalin (2010): New Advantages of Old Kinship Ties: Finnish-Hungarian interactions in the 1970's. In: Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Humphreys, Brendan (ed.) *Winter Kept us Warm: Cold War Interactions Reconsidered*. Bookwell Oy. Jyväskylä, Finland.

Miklossy, Katalin (2011): The Cold War from a New Perspective. In: Autio-Sarasmo, Sari and Miklossy, Katalin (ed.) *Reassessing Cold War Europe*. Routledge Press, New York.

Moss, Walter (2005): *A History of Russia Volume 2: Since 1855*. Anthem Press, London.

Muller, Jan-Werner (2010): On 'European' Memory'? In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 25-37.

Musabegovic, Senadin (2010): The Memory of the Dead Body. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 247-259.

Noll, Jörg and Moelker, René (2010): Netherlands. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 255-267.

Özkan, Behul (2008): Who Gains from the "No War No Peace" Situation? A Critical Analysis of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. Geopolitics, Vol. 13. 572-599.

Pagani, Fabrizio (1997): Financing Peace-keeping and Peace-related Operations. The UN and the OSCE Practice. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 315-343.

Panossian, Razimk (2006): *The Armenians: From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Parkier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (2010): "Introduction: A European memory?" In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 1-24.

Peuch, Jean-Christophe (2001): Armenia/Azerbaijan: International Mediators Report Progress on Karabakh Dispute. *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty.* April 10, 2001. https://www.rferl.org/a/1096184.html. (accessed May 30, 2017).

Phillip, Peterson (1994): Security policy in Post-Soviet Transcaucasia. European Security. Vol.3, No. 1. 1-57.

Prague Office of the OSCE Secretariat (2016): *Recommendations for quoting OSCE documents and using restricted documents as primary sources for academic research on OSCE related subjects.* Researcher-in-Residence Programme. Prague, CZ.

RFE/RL (2006): Nagorno-Karabakh: Timeline of the Long Road to Peace. *Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty.* February 10, 2006. https://www.rferl.org/a/1065626.html (accessed July 31, 2017).

Romashov, Vadim and Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena (2016): Russia's Karabakh policy: new momentum in regional perspective. *Caucasus Survey.* Vol. 5, Is. 2. 1-17.

Ronzitti, Natalino (1997): OSCE Peace-Keeping. In: Bothe, Michael; Ronzitti, Natalino; Rosas, Allan (ed.) *The OSCE in the Maintenance of Peace and Security: Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes*. Kluwer Law International. The Hague, Netherlands. 237-257.

Ruffa, Chiara (2010) Sweden. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 343-357.

Rynning, Sten (2010): Denmark. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 85-97.

Santos, Lori (1994): "Clinton attends CSCE Summit." *United Press International*. December 5, 1994. http://www.upi.com/Archives/1994/12/05/Clinton-attends-CSCE-summit/7869786603600/. (accessed August 7, 2017).

Sarotte, Mary Elise (2010): *1989: The Struggle to Create Post-Cold War Europe*. Princeton University Press, USA.

Savranskaya, *Svetlana.* (2008): In the Name of Europe: Soviet Withdrawal from Eastern Europe. In: Bozo *Europe and the End of the Cold War: A reappraisal.* Routledge Publishing. New York, USA. 36-49.

Seppo, Antti, Tuomas Forsberg (2010): Finland. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 113-123.

Smith, Hanna (2014): *Russian Greatpowerness: Foreign Policy, the Two Chechen Wars and International Organizations.* Department of World politics, University of Helsinki. Helsinki, Finland.

Steinmo, Sven (2008): Historical Institutionalism In: Della Porta, Donatella and Keating, Michael (ed.) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK. 118-138.

Suny, Ronald Grigor (2001): Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations. *The Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 73, No. 4. 862-896.

Tala, Peter and Csiki, Tamas (2010): Hungary. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 165-179.

Terlikowski, Marcin (2010): Poland. In: Biehl, Heiko; Giegerich, Bastian; Jonas Alexandra (ed.) *Strategic Culture in Europe: Security and Defense Policies across the Continent*. Springer Publishing, Potsdam, Germany. 269-280.

Tölölyan, Khachig (2000): Elites and Institutions in the Armenian Transnation. *Diaspora*. Vol. 9 No. 1. 107-136.

Torosyan, Tigran and Vardanyan, Arax (2015): The South Caucasus Conflicts in the Context of Struggle for the Eurasian Heartland. *Geopolitics*. Vol. 20, No.3. 559-582.

Wendt, Alexander (1999): *Social Theory of International Politics.* Waveland Press. Long-Grove, IL USA.

Whitling, Frederick (2010): Damnatio Memoriae and the Power of Remembrance. In: Pakier, Małgorzata and Stråth, Bo (ed.) *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Berghahn Books. New York, USA. 87-97

OSCE Network

Haar, ter Barend (2017): Dutch Narratives about Russian-Western Relations. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 89-98.

Hopmann, Terrence and Zartman, William (ed.) (2013): *Nagorno Karabakh: Understanding Conflict 2013 Conflict Management Program Student Field Trip to the Region.* John Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies. Washington D.C. https://www.sais-jhu.edu/sites/default/files/CM%20Field%20Trip%20NK%20March%2029%20Final_1.pdf. (accessed August 1, 2017).

Lehne, Stefan (1991): *The CSCE in the 1990's: Common European House or Potemkin Village?* Braumüller Publishing, Vienna.

Meier, Larissa Daria (2015): *A Role for OSCE Peacekeeping?: From the 1992 Helsinki Guidelines to the Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine*. CORE Working Paper 27. Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Hamburg, Germany.

Möttölä, Kari (2017): Finland Between the Practice and the Idea: The Significance and Change of Narrative in the Post-Cold War Era. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 11-34.

Nünlist, Christian (2014): Helsinki +40 in the Historical Context. *Security and Human Rights*. No. 25. 198-209.

Nünlist, Christian (2015): Successful Small States in the OSCE and the German Chairmanship of 2016. *Security and Human Rights.* Vol. 26. Is. 1. 48-64.

Nünlist, Christian; Aunesluoma, Juhana; Zogg, Benno (2017): *The Road to the Charter of Paris: Historical Narratives and Lessons for the OSCE Today.* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic institutions. Vienna, Austria.

Nünlist, Christian and Zogg, Benno (2017): Swiss Narratives in the Evolution of European Security 1990-2016. In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 119-130.

OSCE Network (2015): Who We Are. *OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions.* http://osce-network.net/about/. (accessed January 5, 2018).

Remler, Philip (2017): United States Narrative(s). In: Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe: A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany. 171-182.

Zagorski, Andrei (2009): Multilateralism in Russian Foreign Policy Approaches. In: Torjesen, Stina and Rowe, Elana Wilson (ed.) *The Multilateral Dimension in Russian Foreign Policy.* Routledge 2009. 46-57.

Zagorski, Andrei (2017): Russian Narratives. In: Wolfgang Zellner (ed.) *Security Narratives in Europe, A Wide Range of Views.* Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Hamburg, Germany. 99-118.

Zellner, Wolfgang (2014): *Threat Perceptions in the OSCE Area.* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions. Munich Germany.

Zellner, Wolfgang (ed.) (2017): *Security Narratives in Europe: A Wide Range of Views.* The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Nomos. Hamburg, Germany.

Zellner, Wolfgang and Evers, Frank (2014): *The Future of OSCE Field Operations (Options).* OSCE Network of Think Tanks and Academic Institutions. Berlin, Germany.